

July 1

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

The Congress should, by suitable legislation, restrain the REA from financing the construction of steamplant power-generating facilities as supplements to hydroelectric projects in cases where the Congress itself has refused to appropriate funds specifically for such facilities.

12. Comparable rates: Consumers located where they may buy power from Federal projects usually obtain it at a price well below its true cost of production. This is unfair to power consumers who are not so fortunately situated, yet who pay taxes to subsidize the power for others. This inequity to taxpayers and to privately owned utilities is a consequence of several factors.

First, Federal power projects are usually tax exempt. Consumers of electricity supplied by investor-owned electric companies must bear through their electric bills a significant tax burden. In most instances, this amounts to about 23 to 25 percent of the cost of electricity, yet those who obtain their power from Federal projects, in most instances, do not have to pay such taxes.

Second, rates charged to consumers for power from most Federal projects are intended by law to return interest on the unamortized power investment at only 3 percent or less per year. Since it costs the Federal Government about 4 percent to borrow money of a comparable maturity, the result is a subsidy given a few power consumers at the expense of many others.

The Comptroller General of the United States, an agency of Congress, found that the Missouri Basin power projects, from their inception to the end of fiscal 1960, had lost a total of \$51,778,000. The Southwestern Power Administration and its appended power projects, from its inception in 1944 through 1961, had lost \$50,105,000. The Columbia River Power System, on its power operations, had lost \$53,320,000 from 1958 through 1963. The Southeastern Power Administration, on its power operations from 1955 through 1960, had lost \$20,400,000. The sum of these losses was a gift to the users of this power, paid for by taxes collected from citizens in other areas.

Thus, the General Accounting Office has found that major Federal power projects in general do not charge rates sufficient to cover the modest interest charges imposed on them.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12

The rates charged to users of Federal power should be adjusted so that the users of such power do not receive an unfair advantage as opposed to those who do not receive their power from federally subsidized projects.

13. The fossil energy source materials:

Coal: In terms of tonnage, the coal industry is unique in that it has remained relatively static for years. In 1962, the use was as follows: industry 24 percent; coke 20 percent; electricity 48 percent; retail 8 percent; remainder, ammonia and other special chemicals. Recent U.S. production of coal is 440 million tons per annum (1962), about one-seventh of the world production. Coal and natural gas are almost perfectly competitive for the cost of electricity production, about 25 cents per million B.t.u., averaged over the United States (local factors favor one over the other of course). Oil is about one-third higher in cost.

Coal reserves are calculated on the assumption that 50 percent of the known quantities in the ground are "recoverable," depending on technology and economic demand. On the basis of this 50 percent, the present reserves in the United States are 83×10^{10} tons. At 1962 rates, we are then mining 0.05 percent per annum. In other words, at 10 times the present rate of use and with no new finds, we have a 200-year supply—i.e., no case can be made for an imminent shortage of coal.

Natural gas: Probably one of the fastest growing areas of energy source is natural gas, which is increasing at 5 percent per annum. In 1962, a total of 13.9×10^{12} cubic feet were sold. In 1960, the breakdown was 6.5×10^{12} industrial, 4.1×10^{12} residential and commercial, and 1.8×10^{12} field (i.e., losses, etc.).

In the year 1961, proven reserves (economically and technically recoverable) were 275×10^{12} cubic feet. Under present use rates, this is a 20-year supply but both use rates and new finds are increasing so rapidly that this figure does not have much meaning, as is also true in the coal industry.

Petroleum: In 1962 the petroleum-use picture was—gasoline, 1.6×10^{10} barrels; distillate, 74×10^7 barrels; residual, 5.6×10^7 barrels; kerosene 16×10^7 barrels (mostly jet fuel); other, 74×10^7 barrels, including losses, export, etc.

The total demand was 3.8×10^{10} barrels, and the world supply was 8.8×10^{10} barrels, so that U.S. use runs around 40 percent. Net U.S. imports are around 70×10^7 barrels per year or less than 8 percent of use.

The present U.S. proven reserves (under present technology and price structure) are 31.4×10^{10} barrels.

It is generally believed that large reserves of both oil and gas probably lie elsewhere awaiting discovery on this continent and on the coastal shelf.

If an equitable relationship of imports to domestic production is maintained, these energy resources should remain adequate for the foreseeable future. The Eisenhower administration worked out such a policy of balanced relationships in 1959.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13

The Federal Government should maintain a constant surveillance over primary sources of energy and revise its import or other regulations whenever necessary to maintain exploration, adequate supplies, and equitable prices.

14. Atomic energy: As previously noted, the Eisenhower administration gave particular encouragement to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and notable successes were achieved. The first nuclear reactor to produce electrical energy for commercial use was initiated during the Eisenhower administration and built at Shippingport, Pa., with large contributions from private industry.

The cost per kilowatt-hour of electrical energy derived from the fission of uranium, which was estimated at 3 to 10 times the cost of conventional power in 1954, had been reduced by the ingenuity of American scientists and engineers until at the end of the Eisenhower administration plants were under construction whose output was competitive with steam-generating plants in the same areas of the Nation.

Thus, while no early exhaustion of fossil fuels appears to threaten us, and while technology is continually reducing the cost of electrical energy derived from fossil fuels, the remarkable strides in the reduction of power costs from nuclear energy will stimulate a healthy competition to make electricity still cheaper for consumers.

An important research project in the area of nuclear power development is the theoretical feasibility of producing electrical energy from the fusion of light elements such as hydrogen and deuterium. This project, research upon which was meagerly supported until 1953, was given the encouragement of needed appropriations beginning in that year. Very great progress has been made since, but a breakthrough in technology is yet to be achieved. Both the British and Soviet Governments are now believed to have come abreast of our former position of leadership in this area of research. The British effort is said to exceed ours, whereas the Soviet effort is reported to be 200 percent greater than ours.

The significance of power from fusion, if it can be achieved, is (a) the fuel supply is unlimited since it exists in all bodies of water, and (b) the cost of power so produced would be a fraction of present power costs. We understand that this line of research in our own laboratories has been reduced both in priority and support. We believe this to be shortsighted.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14

We recommend a new review of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to determine the areas in which research can be effectively and increasingly supported and to restore the sense of urgency which seems to have yielded to the more glamorous and costly demands of space exploration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is pursuant to my considered practice of having introduced all of their reports into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a group of outstanding Republican leaders in the other House has recently seen fit to deliver themselves of a tirade on policy in Vietnam. I am not surprised that the partisan political knives should be drawn on this issue. What amazes me is that they have come out of the sheaths so early. I can only conclude that they are intended to be used in a preliminary rumble in San Francisco as a warmup for the political war later on.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, that I am not deploring discussion of the Vietnamese situation. It is a serious situation. Any light which can be shed upon it by serious discussion in the House, in the Senate, or anywhere else, for that matter, is to be welcomed.

But a statement which labels the effort being made by thousands of Americans in South Vietnam, and at a cost of many American lives, a "why win" policy is not serious discussion.

Any statement which classifies the complex problem of Vietnam, which has confronted us through the Eisenhower, the Kennedy, and the Johnson administrations, as one peculiarly associated with the latter alone, is not serious discussion.

Any statement which describes a policy that has seen 16,000 American troops, vast naval and air forces deployed in southeast Asian waters, and billions of dollars spent in a region of limited unilateral American interest, as a policy of "pervasive softness," is not serious discussion.

Any statement which assumes that this Government can take operational control of the forces of another nation without assuming, at vast cost in lives and resources, total responsibility for what happens in that nation—in short, any statement which assumes that the purposes of freedom can be achieved in an alien land with an army of foreigners and some bargain-basement techniques of command, is not serious discussion.

Any statement which, in the manner of Colonel Blimp, assumes, from a map, that the mountains, sea, jungles, and rivers—thousands of miles—of the external South Vietnamese borders and of the borders of Vietcong-held areas within

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

sion and the Interior Department should be uncoordinated. This subject should have the prompt attention of the Congress.

6. Uncertainties facing private industry as the present Federal 50-year hydroelectric licenses come up for renewal: Many existing important hydroelectric plants operated by private industry are under 50-year licenses, some of which will come up for renewal by 1970. Private industry is in a dilemma concerning further investments in the generation, transmission, and distribution facilities, because of uncertainty over license renewal. This uncertainty is a deterrent to new industries which might locate in areas where they could contribute to employment and local prosperity.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The Congress should promptly establish a Federal policy on such license renewals, and this policy should not discriminate against private industry over Government ownership.

7. Veto power on the dispatch of electrical transmission lines on public lands: Since the Eisenhower administration left office, the Interior Department has sought to establish control over the terms, conditions, and uses of electrical power transmitted by lines across land owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Power Commission has taken issue with this position of the executive branch. We believe the Federal Power Commission is right in its contentions.

In the 17 Western States the supervision of vast public lands by the Interior Department results in virtual control over all aspects of long-distance transmission of electrical energy. The extent of Federal ownership of Western land is frequently not realized. The chart below indicates the percentage of land owned by the Federal Government in five States:

	Percent
Nevada-----	85.5
Utah-----	68.4
Oregon-----	51.9
Idaho-----	64.6
Wyoming-----	48.2

Since the Interior Department administers the land, private companies, which may wish to transmit power over any large area in the West, are in a position (under the Interior Department's indicated policies) where they can operate only by submitting to conditions imposed not by the Federal Power Commission but by the Department of the Interior.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

We recommend that the Federal Power Commission, free of dictation by the Interior Department, deal with the private transmission of power in the public-land States. The Interior Department should not have veto power in such matters.

8. The lack of adequate hydrological studies: It has now been more than a decade since the first Hoover Commission strongly recommended that more Federal emphasis be placed on obtaining better hydrological data in the United States. The Eisenhower administration, through the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy (PACWRP), made strides in this direction. Since 1961, this effort has received inadequate encouragement.

The recent, outstanding study of the Task Force on Coordinated Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology has made a valuable contribution to the Nation in this respect, but the recommendations of the study have not been implemented. The task force, under its distinguished Chairman, Dr. Roger Revelle of the University of California, was concerned with water primarily for its use by human and industrial consumers. However, the recommendations for better hydrological infor-

mation apply in a parallel way to the need for more information in this area in connection with the generation of hydroelectric energy.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

We endorse the proposals of the Revelle Task Force, since obtaining more data about water will apply to its usefulness in generating electrical energy. We believe the Federal system for obtaining hydrological data should be materially expanded and the agencies involved better coordinated.

9. Coordination among Federal agencies: Under the Eisenhower administration, a significant step forward was taken in coordinating the numerous Federal agencies concerned with generating electrical power, through the creation of PACWRP (see above).

Under PACWRP, policy differences were greatly reduced, in marked contrast to the problem of the Missouri River during the late forties, when it became necessary to organize an ad hoc coordinating group for the Missouri River Basin alone. The so-called Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin was then developed and hailed as evidence that Federal agencies could work together and reconcile the views of two organizations with different objectives. In this instance, one was concerned primarily with flood control and navigation, the other mainly with irrigation. There was not enough water in the Missouri basin to supply all needs, and bureaucratic compromise could not alter that fact. Yet, the Pick-Sloan plan demonstrated a need which was met in considerable degree in the Eisenhower administration, though nothing since has been done along this line.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

The President should insist upon coordination among executive agencies concerned with generating and transmitting electrical energy.

10. The new emphasis in REA on transmission and generation facilities: The Norris-Rayburn Act, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration (the REA), was approved by Congress in 1936, with the announced purpose to bring the advantages of electricity to rural areas. A "rural area" was defined as any portion of the Nation which was not included within the boundaries of a city, village, or borough with a population of more than 1,500 persons. This definition of area is now construed to cover much of suburbia or outer suburbia.

Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, author of the act, convinced the Congress that the law was needed to make electricity available to farms and at reasonable prices. The private power industry had naturally concentrated where the need per capita was greatest and where the demand would make the financing of facilities feasible.

It is amazing to realize that only four decades before the enactment of the Norris-Rayburn Act virtually all of the United States was lighted and fueled by coal, gas, kerosene, and the like. The private electrical generating industry rose during the first three decades of the 20th century from insignificant beginnings into the most important industry in the United States.

Like all of our dynamic fields, the electrical power industry had severe "growing pains." It did not have enough trained people to service the entire United States; and high population density areas were stressed. Private industry serviced major rural areas where the load was adequate, such as central New York State, with its power requirements for dairying, and California, with its irrigation pumping needs. But, the general farming area was not so served in 1936 when the REA was created. Senator Norris correctly pointed out that this was because adequate loads did not exist in most rural areas.

In 1936, 89 percent of all farms were without central service electricity. In 1964, the situation has completely reversed itself; 98 percent of all American farms are electrified through central station service, and most of the remaining 2 percent could be so serviced readily. In this respect, we believe the REA has realized its purpose.

In recent years, however, the REA has placed major emphasis on the building of transmission and generation facilities and on supplying electrical energy to suburbia and outer suburbia. This was not the purpose of the Norris-Rayburn Act. Now that nearly all of the farm population has been supplied with electricity, the REA, as is the common experience with bureaucracies, has sought ways of perpetuating and expanding itself. In the few years since the Eisenhower administration left office, borrowings from the REA to set up facilities for generation and transmission of electrical energy have greatly increased and the trend is sharply upward.

If rural areas are lacking in generation and transmission facilities, they should by all means have them, but we believe it unwise to finance such facilities with Federal funds where adequate and existing private facilities already exist. Numerous examples bear out this point; for instance, the Patuxent area of Maryland and in southern Indiana. In both cases, taxpayers' money was unnecessary since private facilities were available. These recent policies of the REA are not the purposes of the law as expressed by its original congressional sponsors.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

We recommend that the Congress by resolution or the President by Executive order establish a competent objective body to review the original purposes and present activities of the REA. Farmers are entitled to reasonably priced electrical power, but we do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned through the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens. Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low interest rates of REA loans.

11. New steam-generating plants of the REA bypassing Congress: As mentioned in Item No. 10, the REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of electrical energy for consumers not engaged in agriculture. One aspect of this is certainly open to question. On repeated occasions, the Congress has refused to appropriate funds for steam-generating plants as supplements to Federal hydroelectric power projects because private facilities were available. The Congress was obviously unmindful of the fact that hydroelectric power is often sporadic, depending upon rainfall, and that therefore hydroelectric power usually needs to be supplemented with standby steam-generated power. The questionable point is that REA loans have been made apparently to build steamplants for which the Congress had refused to grant funds. Here are examples:

1. 1962—Colorado-Ute Cooperative: The REA provided \$21,602,000 toward financing a 150,000-kilowatt steamplant to firm up power from the Colorado River storage project.

2. 1962—Basin Electric Power Cooperative: A \$36,600,000 loan was made to build a 200,000-kilowatt steamplant, most of the power from which will be disposed of to firm up Missouri Basin power.

3. 1963—Upshur Rural Electric Cooperative: A REA loan of \$9,170,000 was made to build a 33,000-kilowatt steamplant and transmission lines. The Southwestern Power Authority will buy most of the power and lease the transmission lines.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15143

that nation can be sealed off, not with tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of U.S. forces, but with a wave of a statement, is not serious discussion.

Fortunately, Mr. President, there are Republicans who understand the situation in Vietnam from a firsthand experience with it. I refer particularly to our recent Ambassador in Saigon, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. He knows the meaning of what we are attempting in Vietnam and in southeast Asia. He knows the realities of the situation which confronts us. He knows the course of policy which offers the best hope of success. We shall not hear from him any comment about "why win" or "pervasive softness." Here is what we shall hear from him—and I quote from Associated Press dispatch No. 52, on June 30, 1964:

In Vietnam the aim of the struggle is to create a proper political atmosphere. That's how you beat the Communists there. The minute you've created a proper political atmosphere the war is over. That's why I was encouraged by the report I received just before I left Saigon that people are no longer feeding the Communists. I don't see the need for more troops in Vietnam. I think our policy there of relying on the Vietnamese to win with our help is the right policy.

Mr. President, the statement of the House Members to which reference has been made is not an invitation to serious discussion. It obscures the real questions with respect to Vietnam which confront the people of the United States. These questions do need, and should have, discussion. We do need public clarity on rational objectives of policy, not only for Vietnam, but also for all of southeast Asia. We do need public discussion of the means for achieving these objectives—of the military and the diplomatic channels which may be open or can be opened for dealing with the problems of that region which involve not only the United States, but, first and foremost, the people of the region itself, and, in a larger sense, the Chinese, the Russians, the Australians, the British, the French—indeed, in an ultimate sense, all of the people of the world.

That sort of discussion would be helpful to any President, Republican or Democrat, in this serious situation, as he strives, for all of us, to pursue a course which will safeguard our national interests, bring about peace, and preserve the opportunities for freedom in southeast Asia, at the lowest possible cost in American lives.

That is what President Johnson is attempting. Can any President attempt less? Can any President do more?

Mr. President, the Republican task force also made a statement about the weakness of the Nation's military position. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news release by the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, dated June 29, 1964, in reply to that segment of the statement, and also a portion of the remarks made by the President of the United States at the Coast Guard Academy, at New London, Conn., on June 3, 1964.

There being no objection, the news release and the excerpt from the President's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[News release, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964]

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara today issued the following statement:

"I read with regret the partisan attack on our Nation's military program contained in the report of the Republican policy committee's task force on American strategy and strength.

"The national defense has always been a bipartisan activity of the U.S. Government. To date Republicans as well as Democrats have supported the national defense program of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Such support was given to our very first actions in 1961, which were to submit supplemental budget requests that increased the defense budget of this country by \$6 billion for fiscal year 1962. From the beginning of this administration through our current request for fiscal 1965, there has been an increase of \$28 billion over the level of spending that prevailed during the last year of the previous administration. These much needed increases have received bipartisan support throughout the country as a whole as well as in the Congress.

"As a result of these increases, the national security of this country has been greatly enhanced. Since January of 1961, there has been—

"A 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces.

"A 50-percent increase in our strategic bombers on alert.

"A 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear force in Western Europe.

"A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready divisions.

"A 75-percent increase in airlift capability.

"A 100-percent increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.

"A 175-percent increase in the procurement of airlift aircraft.

"A 100-percent increase in the procurement of tactical aircraft.

"A 44-percent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.

"An 800-percent increase in the Department of Defense Special Forces trained to deal with counterinsurgency threats.

"A 15,000-man increase in the strength of the Marine Corps.

"Since 1960, the intercontinental ballistic missiles and Polaris missiles in our arsenal have been increased from less than 100 to over 1,000 and the number of Polaris submarines in commission from 2 to 21.

"Today the intercontinental ballistic missile force of the United States is more than four times that of the Soviet Union.

"As for the future, our research and development program has laid the foundation for a continuing increase in our military strength. Since 1961, there has been—

"A 50-percent increase per year in the total funds expended on research and development over that prevailing during the last 4 years of the previous administration.

"An addition of 208 major new projects. These include 77 weapons programs with costs exceeding \$10 million each, including such major ones as the medium range ballistic missile, the F-111 fighter-bomber and the new main battle tank.

"An increase in expenditures for the development of counterinsurgency weapons and equipment from less than \$10 million in 1960 to over \$103 million requested for fiscal year 1965.

"A 54-percent increase in our antisubma-

rine warfare research and development program in our fiscal 1965 budget request over 1961.

"This tremendous increase in strength could not have been accomplished without the closest cooperation between military and civilian leaders. As Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer said when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: 'I am in constant touch with the Secretary, and through me, or in direct consultation with the Chiefs themselves, he obtains the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,' and 'I would like to reiterate it here, there is the closest possible working relationship between the civilian officials in the Defense Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.'

"Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who succeeded General Lemnitzer as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reaffirmed the existence of this intimate working relationship between the military and civilian leadership in the Pentagon in February of this year. And in June of 1963, General Taylor said, 'the voice of the American soldier is entitled to a serious hearing in our national councils—and I am happy to report that he today receives that hearing.'

"I am confident that there will continue to be the closest of working relationships between the military and civilian leaders of the Pentagon."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

We, as well as our adversaries, must stand in awe before the power our craft has created and our wisdom must labor to control. In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all the nations in the history of the world.

And I confidently predict that strength will continue to grow more rapidly than the might of all others.

The first area of this increasing strength is our ability to deter atomic destruction. In the past 3 years we have increased our nuclear power on alert 2½ times, and our nuclear superiority will continue to grow until we reach agreement on arms control.

We have more than 1,000 fully armed ICBMs and Polaris missiles ready for retaliation. The Soviet Union has far fewer, and none ready to be launched beneath the seas. We have more than 1,100 strategic bombers, many of which are equipped with air-to-surface and decoy missiles to help them reach almost any target. The Soviet Union, we estimate, could with difficulty send less than one-third of this number over targets in the United States.

Against such force the combined destructive power of every battle ever fought by man is like a firecracker thrown against the sun.

The second area of increasing strength is our ability to fight less than all-out war. In the past 3 years we have raised the number of combat ready divisions 45 percent. They can be moved swiftly around the world by an airlift capacity which has increased 75 percent. Supporting tactical aircraft have been increased over 30 percent, and the number of tactical nuclear warheads in Europe has been raised 60 percent. We, and our NATO allies, now have 5 million men under arms. In addition we are now ready to mobilize large reserves in the event of conflict. Six divisions, with all supporting units, can be moved into action in a few weeks.

And we are continuing to build our forces. In a few years our airlift capacity will be five times what it was in 1961. Advanced weapons and equipment are flowing to our armies. Our fleet is being modernized through a decade-long shipbuilding program. And new tactical aircraft are being built.

A third area of increasing strength is the struggle against subversion. Our adversaries, convinced that direct attack would be aimless, today resort to terror, subversion and guerrilla warfare. To meet this threat we began a large effort to train special forces to fight internal subversion. Since January 1961 we have increased these specialized forces eight times. We have trained more than 100,000 officers in these techniques. We have given special emphasis to this form of warfare in the training of all military units.

Our Army now has six Special Action Forces on call around the world to assist our friendly nations. They are skilled in the languages and problems of the area in which they are stationed. The Navy and Air Force have several thousand men whose abilities, training, equipment and mission are designed to combat clandestine attack. And behind these groups are five brigade-size backup forces ready to move into instant action.

But just as subversion has many faces, our responses must take many forms. We have worked to increase and integrate all the resources, political and social as well as military and economic, needed to meet a threat which tears at the entire fabric of a society.

But success in fighting subversion ultimately rests on the skill of the soldiers of the threatened country. We now have 344 teams at work in 49 countries to train the local military in the most advanced techniques of internal defense.

Subversive warfare is often difficult, dirty, and deadly. Victory comes only to those with the desire to protect their own freedom. But such conflict requires weapons as well as will, ability as well as aspiration. And we will continue to increase this strength until our adversaries are convinced that this course too will not lead to conquest.

The fourth area of increasing strength is in the development of new weapons for deterrence and defense. In the past several years we have begun many important new weapons systems. Minuteman II will have twice the accuracy of the first Minuteman. The new Nike X, when its development is completed, will give us the option to deploy, if national security requires it, the best antiballistic missile available to any nation. We are developing a new aircraft, the F-III, with much greater range, payload, and ability at air combat than present tactical bombers or fighters.

The Lance missile, the EX-10 torpedo, the A-7A attack aircraft, a new main battle tank, new antitank missile systems, are the emerging products of development that we are carrying on. And that effort is without parallel in all the world. We will continue to carry forward new projects which offer hope of adding substantially to our strength. I can assure the American people that the United States is, and will remain, first in the use of science and technology for the protection of the people.

DEPLORABLE FINANCIAL STATUS OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD a brief statement describing the deplorable financial condition in which the Children's Hospital of Washington, D.C., finds itself as a result of inadequate funds being made available to it, both through charity and through public sources.

The story is relatively complicated, but I have prepared a chronology as of Friday, June 26, which I ask unanimous

consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL: CHRONOLOGY AS OF FRIDAY, JUNE 26

1. The Senate added \$110,000 to the deficiency appropriation for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1964 for reimbursement increases to Children's Hospital for care of indigents.

2. The House knocked this out in conference, and the conference reports were approved in both Houses. (See Washington Post story of June 4.) But the statement of the managers on the part of the House said: "Deletes the proposal of the Senate to increase the rates paid to Children's Hospital. The managers on the part of the House feel this matter should be the subject of consideration in connection with the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1965."

3. In an excellent editorial, the Washington Post on June 15 called upon the Commissioners, the administration, and Congress to save the Children's Hospital.

4. Thereafter, on June 17, President Johnson sent a message to the Congress containing an amendment adding \$160,000 to the District of Columbia appropriation request for fiscal 1965 to increase reimbursement rates to Children's Hospital for care of indigents. (See text of message, and Washington Post story of June 18.)

5. This money is desperately needed, and it is crucial that the Appropriations Committee act promptly to meet the request.

But the \$160,000 is only part of the story and will not solve the problems of the Children's Hospital created by its service without charge to indigent children in the community.

What is needed is to redefine the term "indigency" so that the hospital can be reimbursed for caring for those who are in fact unable to pay, although they do not meet the present legal criteria of "indigency." (See the excellent Washington Post editorial of June 19.)

6. The true plight of Children's Hospital is hard to appreciate for anyone who is not closely familiar with the situation. A real insight is supplied by President Kauffmann's memorandum, which is attached.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD:

First. A news story from the Washington Post of June 14, 1964, entitled "Hill Conferees Reject Plea for Aid to Deficit-Hit Children's Hospital."

Second. An editorial, also from the Washington Post of June 15, entitled "Unpaid Bills."

Third. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the District of Columbia.

Fourth. A news story from the Washington Post of June 18, entitled "L.B.J. Seeks Funds for Children's."

Fifth. An editorial under date of June 19, published in the Washington Post, entitled "To the Rescue."

Sixth. A copy of a proposed draft of a special report to the board of directors on the state of the Children's Hospital.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 14, 1964]

HILL CONFEREES REJECT PLEA FOR AID TO DEFICIT-HIT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

House-Senate conferees rejected a bid for help to financially ailing Children's Hospital yesterday despite pleas from House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Their action dashed hopes for relief for the hospital during the current fiscal year. It was understood that House conferees argued during the closed meeting that additional money for the hospital would constitute payment of a subsidy to a private institution and might create a precedent for other District hospitals.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, reportedly made a strong plea for the \$110,000 request—part of the \$1.4 billion deficiency bill approved earlier by the Senate—which would have permitted the city to increase payments to the hospital for the care of needy children.

The House-Senate conference referred the matter to the District Appropriations subcommittees of both Houses for action in the city's budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The House earlier denied the Commissioners' \$110,000 request, but the Senate approved funds to help in the hospital's financial emergency. Rejection by the House-Senate conference came as a surprise because of House Speaker McCormack's endorsement earlier this week.

The hospital has a current operating deficit of \$476,000. The hospital board has authorized an emergency fund raising campaign to keep the institution open. Dr. Robert Parrott, hospital director, yesterday expressed "surprise and disappointment" over the conference action and said the board would now have to "examine very closely" what the hospital can do for needy children over the summer.

"I would hope that the Appropriation Committees of Congress," he said, "will examine the entire situation and take action in the upcoming fiscal year to allow the District government to assume a fuller part of its responsibility for the care of District youngsters."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1964]

THE UNPAID BILLS

Under the lash of hard necessity, the District Commissioners are at last considering the simplest and most obvious solution to the impending disaster at Children's Hospital. The city must reform the crabbed and perverse rules that govern a child's eligibility for medical aid.

Children's Hospital loses about \$300,000 a year in the unpaid bills of children who are indigent by every definition but the Health Department's. Unlike the city's own clinics, the hospital cares for sick children regardless of their eligibility for medical aid. The hospital's deficit is currently running above half a million dollars a year, and within a few months the hospital will be as destitute as the least prosperous of its patients.

Out of over 100 children whom the hospital admits as indigents, the Health Department considers only about 50 to be eligible for public medical aid. The hospital cares for the others, certainly, but the whole cost of that care is borne by the hospital itself.

Thirty out of every hundred indigent patients are ineligible because the Department's family unit rule creates a void of responsibility. Under the law, a child's parents are responsible for the hospital bill. Under the family unit rule, any relative living in the same house is responsible. In a

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15239

Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, was recently honored by the New Jersey State Bar Association, and was selected as the recipient of the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "distinguished community service by Americans of Italian descent."

I have known and worked with Mr. Noto for several years. He is an outstanding and dedicated public servant, and I am proud to add my congratulations to the many he has already received for his fine record of public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution by the New Jersey State Bar Association, honoring Mr. Noto, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE
BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association, has a specific interest in the operation and procedures of immigration and nationality law; and

Whereas the members of this section have appeared before county bar associations' meetings as well as before patriotic and civic groups to discuss various phases of the law; and

Whereas the membership of this section participates actively in furthering the understanding of the immigration and nationality law among leading organizations in this State; and

Whereas the Honorable Mario T. Noto, Associate Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, has been invited to receive the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "Distinguished Community Service by Americans of Italian Descent"; and

Whereas this section regards this merited award with high favor in recognition of the dedicated public and community services rendered by the Honorable Mario T. Noto: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association extends to Associate Commissioner Mario T. Noto, its congratulations and best wishes for continued success in all his endeavors.

Done at the city of Newark on the 27th day of April 1964.

AMERIGO D'AGOSTINO, *Chairman*.
I. ARTHUR LEVY, *Secretary*.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a column appearing in tonight's Evening Star by Max Freedman, entitled "Three Senators Agree on Vietnam."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964]

THREE SENATORS AGREE ON VIETNAM—FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, CHURCH BELIEVE U.N. SHOULD DEFER ANY INTERVENTION

(By Max Freedman)

In the Senate the other day Senator CHURCH started a debate that soon spread to a discussion of the United Nations and the war in Vietnam. He did not intend to provoke such a discussion; he really wanted to

speak up in support of the United Nations and to protect it from attack by people like Senator GOLDWATER. But the mere mention of Vietnam was enough to stir a lively debate.

The first point to be noted about this discussion was that only Democrats took part in it. Senator GOLDWATER has tried to break the Republican Party into organized opposition to the way the Johnson administration has been behaving in Vietnam; but thus far his success has been negligible. The Republicans cannot shake out of their minds the warning by Ambassador Lodge that America's involvement in Vietnam dates back to the Eisenhower administration and since then has been supported by both parties. It is utterly unconvincing for Senator GOLDWATER to pretend now that he or any other Republican has a solution which is being willfully ignored by the folly of Washington.

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, PELL, PROXMIER, and MORSE. An exception, however, must be made of Senator MORSE. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator MORSE should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

It is more useful to concentrate on Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator HUMPHREY. In Senator FULBRIGHT's judgment, the essential task now is to stabilize the military situation as the prelude to any political initiatives that may yet be taken. At present he sees no great role for the United Nations in putting an end to the struggle. But he does not exclude a possibility later. "If conditions should arise," Senator FULBRIGHT told the Senate, "in which it would be feasible for the United Nations to take over and maintain order, I would be in favor of that." Senator HUMPHREY, trying to put at rest all fears of a larger war, said "I do not favor accelerating the war. I believe I can say this Government does not." He agreed with Senator FULBRIGHT that one day the influence of the United Nations might well be both timely and constructive.

Quite plainly Senator CHURCH had impressed his colleagues by his warning against any new policy that would commit the United States to military attacks on Vietnam and military decisions that might also provoke a clash with China. No one dissented from his warning that we must ponder our next steps very carefully "if we are to avoid a tragic trail of casualties in Asia out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States."

Some weeks ago great interest was taken in the announcement that Harlan Cleveland, who is in charge of United Nations affairs for the State Department, would attend the Honolulu Conference to review the problems of Vietnam and southeast Asia. It was generally felt that his presence in Honolulu would focus attention on what the United Nations could do to end the danger of a spreading war.

As it turned out Mr. Cleveland was unable to leave Washington because sudden anxieties over Cyprus kept him here. But that does not mean that he and his officials are avoiding the close and continuous study of what the United Nations can do, at the right time, to promote stability and peace in this whole restless area.

Mr. MORSE. I shall proceed to answer that column by Mr. Freedman in respect to its references to the senior Senator from Oregon. In the course of the column Mr. Freedman says:

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, PELL, PROXMIER and MORSE. An exception, however, must be made of Senator MORSE. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator MORSE should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

Mr. President, Mr. Freedman should get out to the hustings. Mr. Freedman should acquaint himself with American public opinion. For the benefit of Mr. Freedman, I incorporate by reference now every criticism that I have made of American foreign policy in southeast Asia, including the criticism to which he takes exception.

In his column today in the Washington Star Max Freedman undoes all the sound commentary he offered the American people last week when he warned:

Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such a crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one in which the Johnson administration has now stumbled.

Of course, he published that column in the Washington Evening Star, which contained the editorial paying its disrespect to the senior Senator from Oregon. I answered it some days ago on the floor of the Senate. In my reply to the editor of the Washington Star, I said that he should have read the column by Max Freedman published in the same issue that contained its editorial attacking the senior Senator from Oregon.

It is interesting to note this complete change of journalistic coloring on the part of Mr. Freedman in so short a time.

I wonder why. Could it be that his editors did not like the fact that in that column he took the position of the senior Senator from Oregon? As I pointed out, in that column Freedman laid down the major thesis of the criticism by the senior Senator from Oregon of shocking American policy in southeast Asia which, I repeat, in all probability, if it is not reversed, will lead us into a major war in Asia.

Today Mr. Freedman sounds frightened of his own analysis of our foreign policy in South Vietnam, which he published only a few days ago. On June 25 he pointed out that the threat of war made by administration officials against China "is more likely to divide and worry American opinion than it is to frighten Peiping or to serve the cause of peace." But that is the only logical end to a policy we are now following in southeast

Asia. Our policy of military buildup and overwhelming economic aid to South Vietnam has failed to halt rebels successes. The next step was to threaten expansion of the war if the Communists did not voluntarily retreat.

The Government of the United States is threatening war in Asia. Let those who believe it is not stand up and deny it, for we cannot read the statements of this Government, from the President on down, and fail to recognize that those statements add up to a threat to war prosecuted by the United States in Asia unless Red China, Laos, North Vietnam and other areas do the bidding of the United States.

Having made the threat, we will have no choice but make good on it when the Communists decline to retreat. This entire policy depends upon Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung backing down before a threat that if they do not, their territory will be attacked by the United States.

One may as well expect the United States to leave Vietnam upon threat of dire consequences if we do not.

Mr. Freedman is also frightened of the concept that the United States is itself violating international agreements in southeast Asia. And we are. He does not deny that we are. He does not try to show that our actions are in conformity with the Geneva accords of 1954, or 1962, or with the United Nations Charter, because that is impossible. He merely puts a nasty label on anyone who does point out the bitter truth of the U.S. illegal action in southeast Asia—illegal action in southeast Asia that violates the United Nations Charter in articles 33, 36, 37, and 51—to mention only four specific instances of our violation.

Let Mr. Freedman or anyone else deny it. They cannot deny it if they can read the English language. The language is perfectly clear as to the obligation of any signatory to that Charter and the course of procedural action that should follow whenever peace is threatened anywhere in the world. Peace is seriously threatened in southeast Asia, and the responsibility of the United States is clear. We should take the threat to the United Nations, and not set ourselves up as the policeman of the world, self-appointed, to enforce our interpretation of existing treaties such as the Geneva accords.

Mr. Freedman may as well try to prove that the United States has the legal right to enforce a treaty between Russia and China as to prove that we have a unilateral right to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954, when we are not a party to them.

Who are we to set ourselves up as the enforcement country of the Geneva accords of 1954 when we did not even sign the accords, and when John Foster Dulles used his influence to prevent South Vietnam from signing them?

When we recognize that a violation of a treaty is threatening the peace of the world, this country has a clear duty to file charges before the United Nations. That the United States has not done. I wonder why. I wonder if it might be

that if the United Nations took jurisdiction it would find plenty of illegality on the part of the conduct of the United States to date in the course of action it has been following in southeast Asia?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I will confess I was also surprised at the abrupt about-face change in the attitude of Mr. Freedman from his previous article, in which he supported the view that the senior Senator from Oregon and I have been advocating, that we should stop our participation in the war in southeast Asia and try to wage peace; that it was a war we could not win militarily; that it was a war in which we should not have engaged in the first place; and that we should go to the United Nations and try to find a solution there.

Mr. Freedman published a column earlier, which either the senior Senator from Oregon or I put in the *Record*, to that effect. I am interested in the sudden change. What happened in between the publication of the two articles?

Mr. MORSE. We have our suspicions.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of various explanations.

Mr. MORSE. But they would not rebound to the credit of Mr. Freedman.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know that I can comment on that; but, in any event, I think it is a regrettable change of attitude and an inconsistency that it would be useful for the columnist to explain to his readers.

Mr. MORSE. For the edification of Mr. Freedman, I repeat again that the United States is violating one international agreement after another by our policy in southeast Asia. We have already violated the 1954 Geneva agreement, and have been found in violation by the International Control Commission. We have admitted to violations of the Geneva accords of 1962, with the excuse that some one else violated them first.

This country has even sent into Laos armed military planes that have dropped bombs, which constitutes an act of war and aggression. It is a clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which this country signed, and which I believe thereby constitutes an even more serious reflection on the United States. We have freely admitted to these violations, pointing out only that North Vietnam violated them first.

Our violations of the United Nations Charter, as I have pointed out time and time again in the past several weeks, have been many, and they are continuing up to the moment I speak.

The very assumption of Freedman and those he quotes that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances, the United States will seek United Nations action is evidence that all of them know the issue is one of U.N. jurisdiction.

What they are all saying is only that they do not think that to adhere to the U.N. Charter now would serve American interests.

Are we to take the position that this country is being a peace-abiding nation; that we are going to resort to its obligations under treaties and international law only when we think to do so would serve our interests? If every country takes that position, that is the end of international law. International law then ceases to be of any force or effect in maintaining peace in the world, and becomes nothing but a sham and a shibboleth.

But when, under that type of international expediency, would this country ever take such a matter to the United Nations? Would we do it when war has engulfed North Vietnam? Do we think that when China is faced with the same situation she was faced with in Korea she will do what we have refused to do, and take the issue to the United Nations?

If we set such an example, we set the precedent for other nations to defy their obligations under international law.

Do we think that Red China will be willing to go to the U.N. or to the bargaining table when the war goes against her, although we refused to do so under the same circumstances?

What a folly! What a poor, lame, pathetic excuse for a war in Asia! "Now is not the time to negotiate; wait until we dominate the battlefield and then we will negotiate." If countries follow that course of action, there will be no sense in talking about resorting to the rule of law for settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world. We shall then prove that our objective is to return to the jungle law of American military might.

I can see the United States going to the United Nations or the conference table had Russia come to dominate the Caribbean in 1962.

Mr. President, if we are going to take the position that the time to negotiate does not exist until we dominate the battlefield, then when we dominate the battlefield of southeast Asia, Red China will throw all she has into southeast Asia.

Remember this about our policy in Asia: A nation does not have to commit the first violation in order to be in violation of the Geneva accords. And it does not have to commit aggression in order to be in violation of the United Nations Charter; and all the journalistic squirming and weaseling by the Freedmans cannot change that ugly fact and that sad indictment against the United States.

We have violated these accords and the United Nations Charter time and time again. We are pursuing neither law nor peace in Asia. We are not even pursuing freedom. We are maintaining a military, tyrannical dictatorship over the South Vietnamese, headed by an American puppet to whom we give the orders, and who moves only under our orders.

Mr. President, whoever fights a war without taking the matter to the United Nations, is in violation of the charter, whether that party started the war or not.

The United States cannot hide itself behind the alibi that we are not the only ones who are violating the Geneva ac-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15241

cords and the United Nations Charter. Of course we are not. The Communists in Asia are violating international law, too; but since when can the United States justify an act of illegality because someone else is committing an act of illegality? The fact that North Vietnam and the Communists in Laos and Red China are also threatening the peace in Asia does not justify our walking out on our international obligations. To the contrary, it makes it more important that we lay the charges before the United Nations, or go to a 14-nation Conference, or seek to get SEATO to come in and exercise peacekeeping policies until the United Nations can take over jurisdiction.

That has been the thesis of the Senator from Oregon for weeks. It will continue to be my thesis so long as my country follows its course of outlawry in southeast Asia. "Outlawry," I remind Max Freedman, means outside the law, and our policy in Asia today is outside the law.

Mr. Freedman's column today somehow carries all the overtones and pathos of the diplomats and generals who led their countries into World War I. It was always going to be the other side that was going to back down in the face of a magnificent navy or army or military machine, and any treaty that was inconvenient to national interests became "just a scrap of paper."

I never thought the time would come when my country would treat existing treaties as scraps of paper. My country's violation of the Geneva accords, of the United Nations Charter, and the Constitution itself, reflect the attitude of treating international obligations and constitutional obligations as scraps of paper.

Some of us have liked to think that the championing of the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson, and later our active sponsorship of the United Nations marked an American commitment to the rule of law in world affairs, including our own interests in world affairs.

What we are doing in Asia is setting the United States above all that. Once we have decided an American interest was at stake, we have ignored our treaty obligations and our obligations to the United Nations. We have cranked up the American military machine to move into Asia.

The apologists who piously deplore spreading the war, but who in the meantime want to continue it in South Vietnam and Laos, rather than negotiate, are scarcely different from those who want to expand it. The war in South Vietnam is not going to get better for us. Perhaps it will not get any worse but I see no chance that it will get better. And the longer it continues under those circumstances, the more certain it is that the war will be expanded.

If a nation wants to live up to its international commitments, it must live up to them and not find excuses for avoiding them. The only policy in the world I am advocating for the United States is that we live up to the Geneva Accords and the U.N. Charter.

For Mr. Freedman's benefit, I repeat the language to which he takes such exception: The United States is violating one international commitment after another.

So we are.

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last point I wish to make deals with the action taken by the Senate today in confirming the nomination of General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam.

When the Senate took that action—and I understand there were only a few Senators on the floor when it took place—I was downstairs in the Committee on Foreign Relations presenting an argument against a shocking waste of taxpayer funds in a foreign aid program that is in need of drastic revision.

I was not aware that the Taylor nomination was to be brought up at that time. It was well known that I voted against the confirmation of the Taylor nomination in committee. I wish briefly to say for the record that I think nominating General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam was a most unfortunate mistake, and for the following reasons:

First, it is known around the world that General Taylor was one of the architects, along with McNamara and Rusk, of the war plans of the United States in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that we should send as our Ambassador to South Vietnam a military leader—and a very able military leader he is, too—when all the world has its eyes turned to the hope for peace. The appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam increases the possibility of our going into a full scale war in Asia if the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese do not back down under American threats.

I am also satisfied that General Taylor will not hesitate to advocate the escalating of that war into North Vietnam and into Red China and into Laos if the Red Chinese do not quiver and quake and retreat.

I have great regard for General Taylor as a military leader. If we get into a war, I believe we shall find that most military experts in this country will agree with the observation I now make, namely, that we probably have a no more able potential theater commander for that war than General Taylor. But he has no place behind the desk of an Ambassador.

There is a growing trend in this Republic for the military to take over more and more policy determinations. I had hoped that we would make it more clear than it has been made to date that under our constitutional system it is not for the military to determine policy, but to carry out orders; and that American foreign policy should be determined by the civilian branch of the Government—by the President, his chief agent, the Secretary of State, and the Congress.

The symbolism of putting this general behind an Ambassador's desk in South Vietnam is uncalled for and unfortunate. It will be subject to great misunderstanding, and will accrue to the great disadvantage of the standing of the United States in many parts of the world, particularly in the so-called underdeveloped nations. I am satisfied that great fear is developing toward the United States in the underdeveloped nations. They are beginning to see great differences between our preachments and our practices, and are beginning to raise questions about the hypocrisy of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

Furthermore, I have heard General Taylor as a witness before the Foreign Relations Committee over a period of years. He has demonstrated his great ability, his wide knowledge, and his expertness in the field of military affairs. But he has never instilled any confidence in his ability in the field of foreign policy.

How well I remember the stunning shock that I suffered at the time of the Berlin crisis when, listening to General Taylor and General White, I came to realize that I was listening to two American military leaders who would not hesitate to drop the nuclear bomb, as though that would settle any issue involving the peace of the world.

General Taylor is among those in the Pentagon who has an itchy trigger finger when it comes to the use of nuclear power in case we are challenged and our bluff is called. I want to avoid those challenges. I think one of the best ways to avoid those challenges is to have the United States stop bluffing, because we may have our bluff called.

The sad thing is that if we do, a nuclear war will be on, and there will be no victory. I have no confidence whatever in General Taylor in the field of American foreign policy. Taking his uniform off and putting him behind an Ambassador's desk will not change the fact that his orientation is the orientation of the military, not the orientation of civilian foreign policy.

The symbolism of his appointment is most unfortunate. My President should have selected someone such as the man he selected as Deputy Ambassador, Mr. Alexis Johnson, or some other outstanding career officer in the Foreign Service of the State Department, rather than to dip into the Pentagon and take a military general to direct American foreign policy in southeast Asia.

As I said to Mr. Lodge in person yesterday, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is unfortunate that a former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the former Ambassador of the United States to South Vietnam, should return to the United States and tell the American people, in effect, that the time is not propitious for us to take the southeast Asia crisis to the United Nations. I shall never be able to understand how a former Ambassador to the United Nations could demonstrate such a complete failure to uphold our obligations under

the United Nations Charter. If it were not so tragic, it would be amusing, when one considers the answer he has given to the proposal to go to a 14-nation conference, as recommended by the President of France, Mr. de Gaulle. What are we afraid of? No one is suggesting that while we are at that 14-nation Conference we should abandon southeast Asia. No one is suggesting that while the Security Council and, if necessary, the General Assembly consider the United Nations jurisdiction, we remove ourselves from southeast Asia, although I wish we would desist from our warmaking in southeast Asia and start a policy of peacekeeping.

I would, as I have said so many times, while the matter is before a 14-nation Conference, as recommended by De Gaulle, or before the Security Council or before the General Assembly, call upon our alleged—and I underline the word “alleged”—SEATO allies to join us with a sufficient body of men to patrol the area, to keep the adversaries separate, and to stop the killing and warmaking until the procedures of the United Nations can be brought to work upon the threat to the peace of Asia and, potentially, the peace of the world.

The position taken by Henry Cabot Lodge cannot be reconciled to any degree with the clear international obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter.

I did not expect that the stature of the President of France for peacekeeping would rise above the stature of the President of the United States; but at this hour, that is exactly what is happening. The President of France is becoming recognized in many areas of the world as more determined and dedicated to the cause of peace than the President of the United States, because the President of France is calling for negotiation. The President of France is calling for the conference table. The President of France is calling for the application of the rule of law to the threat of peace in Asia.

The President of the United States is rattling the saber and telling the world that we are willing to risk war with Red China unless Asia accepts American policy in southeast Asia.

I cannot understand why my Government cannot see, before it is too late, that that kind of warmaking policy on the part of the United States spells trouble. Let me make it clear, as I close, that there is no question that we are joined in our outlawry by South Vietnam, by North Vietnam, by the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, and by Red China.

Does that justify our outlawry? Does that justify the policy of expediency applied to international affairs which best describes American policy tonight in Asia? Does the end-justifies-the-means principle square with American precepts of foreign policy?

Since when do two wrongs make a right?

Never before has that been our policy. I pray again that my country will see the horrendous mistake it is making in Asia as a matter of policy, before it is too late.

I close by saying, for the benefit of those who do not like my speeches and for the benefit of such journalists as Mr. Freedman, “You had better check it with the American people.”

I am satisfied that millions of fellow Americans, as they begin to understand the issue at stake in southeast Asia, will support my position.

I can now say, along with the Senator from Alaska, that my mail is running better than 100 to 1 in support of my position. My mail is coming in from coast to coast, as Senators will see some samples placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time. I placed a large quantity in the RECORD today. It is coming from the leaders of many communities in this country.

I wish to state to President Johnson that I am satisfied that the American people do not approve of America's warmaking policy in Asia, and that the American people wish the President of the United States to join with the President of France and other advocates of negotiation, that we go to the conference table and seek to apply the rule of law to the crisis which exists in Asia.

I say most respectfully to my President, whom I shall continue to support on most issues, that I oppose him on this issue only because I owe a greater trust to my country than I owe to him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment as members on the part of the Senate of the National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Senate Joint Resolution 71, the following Senators, namely, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is in the Chamber; and we have discussed the problem presented to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee in meeting tomorrow, in view of the time set for the beginning of the session of the Senate.

We have cleared this with those involved, and I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, not only is there no objection, but I also concur in the request of the Senator from Michigan and wish to confirm that there has been clearance on this matter with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HART by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2972) for the relief of Dr. David J. Sencer, U.S. Public Health Service, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted two amendments (Nos. 1089 and 1090), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment (No. 1091), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment (No. 1092), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendment (No. 1093), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES— AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acqui-

15148

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

tionally supported the hospital or a much broader, public type, appeal. The board of directors of the hospital believes that such an additional appeal would receive much greater reception if the effort were to be matched closely by the Government's assuming its fair share of the financial burden for the medical care of the poor.

CAN NATIONAL CAPITAL AFFORD NOT TO HAVE MAJOR CHILD HEALTH CENTER?

In the final analysis there are the questions: Can the Nation's Capital continue to afford a specialized institution devoted to the all around medical care of children? Also, what will happen if Children's Hospital ceases to exist in its present form?

The answer to these questions lies at the heart of the matter.

Of all places in the world, the Nation's Capital should feel that it can afford to travel first class in this respect. Children deprived of the corrective health measures that modern medicine is capable of providing may grow up to cause the community vast expense in terms of institutional care for adolescents and adults, in terms of delinquency and crime, in terms of unemployment brought about by physical and mental handicaps. Such ills can be prevented if the skills represented by the core of dedicated men and women brought together on a team basis such as those at Children's Hospital are brought to bear on a solution to these problems at an incipient stage.

This kind of child health care is available and needed and used at Children's Hospital now, not only by the indigent family but by families at all income levels, including those on the Government payroll. It is used, for example, by the families of Members of Congress and of the diplomatic corps.

The hospital and its various programs have been selected for visits by royalty, visiting statesmen and professional persons from all over the world.

Infants and children in families who may not even have heard of the hospital have benefited indirectly from its presence by and through the fact that it is training doctors and nurses in the finest of child health practice, is carrying out research to understand and combat children's problems.

But the Nation's Capital is beset by many problems. It may be that the specific problems of the future existence of Children's Hospital in its present form—a children's medical center, evolved through nearly a century of devotion to child health into the force for good in the community that it now is—cannot be salvaged in the context of life as it exists in the Nation's Capital today.

This statement of the situation represents what amounts to a last resort. If it fails of response, the corporate members of and directors of Children's Hospital will be forced to make such adjustments and to adopt such solutions as the hard realities of the situation dictate.

RUDOLPH KAUFFMAN II,
President, Children's Hospital of the
District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the desirability of the Congress rallying to the rescue of this splendid institution which may be forced to close its doors unless finances are provided for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for a very minor remark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business?

REPUBLICAN STATEMENT OF AMERICAN POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] commented upon the statement made by some 55 Republicans in the House on Vietnam.

I have read the statement. I do not agree with one portion of it, at least. That portion is, as I remember, that it recommended that American commanders should take command of the Vietnamese troops. I rise nevertheless to say—as I happen to be one of the few Republicans on the floor at this time—that I believe this statement, whether the Senator agrees with it or not, or I do, brings into play the very debate that he, himself has recommended, that Vietnam should be discussed, and discussed openly and objectively.

I might also say, without any attempt to compare this particular statement with other statements that have been made in the Senate, that policy in Vietnam has been discussed on the floor of the Senate for months. Some Members of the majority have been, almost daily, very critical of the administration's position on Vietnam. The majority leader, himself, has an alternative to the program of the administration in Vietnam.

I would not want to stop by making these comments. I believe that it is necessary to maintain the strength of our troops in Vietnam, a strength capable of maintaining our position.

I believe also that every possible alternative should be considered which would be helpful. I would advocate a convocation of the Geneva Conference, not with the purpose of agreeing to neutralization, but with the purpose of seeing if there is any possibility of any agreement that would recognize two separate, sovereign countries, and support for the position, and support against the continued aggression and subversion of North Vietnam. Thus could lead, I hope, to the establishment of multilateral patrols along the borders.

I think such a convocation might involve the possibility, however doubtful it may be, of staying increased military movements which could lead to escalation and final confrontation of the United States and Communist China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with the entire statement made relating to American command of the Vietnam forces, but the House Members have the right to state their positions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator may be extended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so agreed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all averse to a reconvening of the Geneva Conference to consider the situation in Laos. I am not at all averse either, un-

der certain circumstances, to a reconvening of the Geneva Conference of 1954 covering the situation in Vietnam and the other parts of what used to be known as French Indochina. But I certainly cannot imagine the Senator from Kentucky, with his wide experience as a diplomat, as a member of the State Department, and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, agreeing to a proposal which would make that a war under direct American military command and control in a foreign country.

Mr. COOPER. I just said that I did not agree with such a suggestion. I said that the majority leader took occasion to criticize the proposal, which I do not agree with; but I must say that almost every day Senators, on his side are disagreeing with the administration position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The majority leader himself has offered alternatives, constructive proposals, I believe that alternatives should be constructive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I said in my remarks, I welcome discussion. All I hope is that the discussion will be constructive. I do not care for opposition on the part of either Republicans or Democrats for the sake of opposition. If a Senator is going to oppose, he should come forth with a constructive alternative, if he finds fault with a policy which the Nation has in effect at the time he makes his remarks or offers his solution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to address myself to the subject under discussion. I am grateful to the majority leader for remaining while I do so. It is interesting that the report of the task force on the part of the Republican Party in the House is side by side with the report of Ambassador Lodge to the people of the United States and to the President. I wish to identify myself with that group which believes, regardless of party, that we must stick it out in Vietnam. I do not believe that we ought to pull out. I believe there is too much at stake for us to pull out. Also I do not believe that we should overtly extend the war into North Vietnam, which has been recommended by some. I feel that while Senators, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] has said, have every right to speak and should be encouraged to speak and have been encouraged to speak their views, I cannot accept the proposition that any American President would not wish to win a struggle in which American lives and the destiny of freedom are concerned. I do not believe that there should be any implication in their statement, much as they may differ with the policy which is involved.

The majority leader has called for constructive suggestions.

First, there is no question about the fact that a U.N. role in the problem is essential. In my judgment, we should press for a U.N. role—at least some role along the borders which are allegedly be-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15147

and presumably throughout its entire history. After all, it was founded as a charitable institution. And it has tried to conduct itself as one, its board of directors having been guided by the statement in its original charter below:

"Be it known to all whom it may concern, that we, * * * citizens of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, have associated ourselves together pursuant to the provisions of the 3d section of the act of Congress, approved May 5, 1870, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," for the purpose of establishing a charitable institution in said District, to be used as a hospital and dispensary for the treatment of the medical and surgical diseases of children, where all such may be treated gratuitously: *Provided, however,* That the board of directors may provide for the admission of sick children whose parents or guardians may be willing and able to defray the expenses thereof."

To implement this policy, and to fulfill its obligation to the community as set forth in its charter, it has sought and obtained from generous friends and supporters substantial funds. Also it has received specific endowments and unrestricted bequests, made to it because it was a charitable institution.

In the period covered by the statistics above, for instance, it sought and obtained annual donations through its annual sustaining fund appeal and its annual Christmas card appeal as follows:

TABLE IV.—Gifts and donations from sustaining fund and Christmas card appeal

Year ending—	Card appeal	Sustaining fund	Total
June 30, 1963.....	\$31,163	\$116,446	\$147,609
June 30, 1962.....	27,698	103,599	131,297
June 30, 1961.....	75,806	102,206	178,012
June 30, 1960.....	53,566	91,018	144,574
June 30, 1959.....	61,828	-----	61,828

And it received in this same period unrestricted bequests totaling \$837,642, more than half of which was required for day-to-day operations.

To meet its deficits it has, of course, spent the revenues from these appeals. It also has spent to finance its day-in-day-out operations not only the income from an endowment fund of \$1,243,479, but also all of the income from and \$445,000 of the capital of funds that have come to it in the form of unrestricted bequests.

To sum up, it has been ready, willing, and able to spend nonoperating income and capital in the period under review as follows:

TABLE V.—Expenditure of nonoperating income and capital for recent 5 years

Year ending June 30, 1963.....	\$440,821
Year ending June 30, 1962.....	389,080
Year ending June 30, 1961.....	407,282
Year ending June 30, 1960.....	367,549
Year ending June 30, 1959.....	243,075

But the hard fact of the matter is that taking nonoperating income and capital from all available sources into account, it now finds itself with only \$143,000 to meet deficits that are averaging \$40,000 each month.

STOPGAP APPROPRIATION REQUIRED

To find some way to avoid the inevitable financial collapse of the hospital, the officers of the board of directors have taken their case to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who have agreed to ask Congress for a supplemental appropriation of \$110,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. The amount of this request is based on reimbursement for units of service which the hospital provided solely for patients ruled eligible for tax support at a rate somewhat greater than that presently provided but less than the hospital's audited cost of care. If this is granted it will provide only temporary relief.

The hospital is informed that the Government of the District of Columbia is precluded from making exception to the prevailing strict rules of eligibility for health care. Presumably only Congress itself can order relief from losses in this category by specifically exempting the medical care of children from the eligibility rules. If the hospital is to survive, or at least survive in its present form, relief of both sorts is necessary.

INDIGENT CARE VITAL PART OF CENTER

This immediately suggests an important question which the community not only has every right to ask but should ask:

Why not send the patients who are causing these losses and who in many communities would be the responsibility of the taxpayer, to the city's public hospital, the District of Columbia General Hospital?

The answer to this question also falls in several parts:

1. District of Columbia General Hospital already is caring for a capacity patient load of children.

2. Except under emergency conditions, the thousands of indigent children who are not eligible for Government reimbursement at Children's Hospital are not eligible for care at District of Columbia General Hospital. In fact, without Children's Hospital, there is no place to provide their health care needs under present regulations.

3. Thus, Children's Hospital cares for as many, and in some cases more, sick children who cannot pay for their care than does District of Columbia General Hospital. It serves the northerly sections of the city for Government-eligible patients in the same way as District of Columbia General serves the southerly sections of the city. It is, therefore, the other half of facilities for such care and traditionally has been treated as the privately operated half of a public-private partnership devoted to caring for the city's sick poor children, having been expanded and modernized to do the job by the investment of over \$2 million of matching Government funds in recent years. There is no "third" place for them to go in any important numbers.

4. Children's Hospital has been planned and staffed and its plant has been financed to do this job. In fact it was doing it as the sole such institution in the District of Columbia before the creation of a children's unit at District of Columbia General Hospital. Perhaps it should be compared to an eight-cylinder automobile; its operation could hardly be cut in half by removing four of the cylinders, and it is doubtful it would run at all in such a condition. To put it another way, Children's Hospital's ability to perform the charity task is built into its total function as a children's medical center providing the finest of health care for all types of patients, including those who can pay. Thus, if the institution remains prepared to meet fully the child health needs of the community, it is doubtful that important savings could be realized from simply turning away sick children even if they arrived at the door properly tagged "eligible" or "ineligible" which, of course, they do not.

5. In order to carry out the care of the charity patients at less expense and to provide a stimulus to improved care for all patients and to fulfill a responsibility as a complete medical center, the hospital has, over the years, developed some of the country's best recognized training and research programs in child health. While the presence of teaching programs allows the charity care to be carried out at lesser cost, it is also true that the presence of charity or "ward" patients allows a stronger teaching and research program. A significant cut-back in charity patients would in proportion diminish the strength of the teaching and research programs as well as narrow the spectrum of available health care services.

And, at some point, it could no longer serve as well the purpose of educating young doctors and nurses. It might no longer attract and hold highly skilled specialists who gravitate to an institution because of teaching and research opportunities thus concentrating for the benefit of the entire community in one place a central pool of specialized medical skills. If Children's Hospital were bereft of this concentrated team of specialists there would be little real justification for its existence. That function could just as well be fulfilled by adding beds for children at each of the general hospitals of the community.

Thus a specialty hospital like Children's is a meld of complex and interdependent parts. Take one part away and the whole tends to fall apart and become, relatively speaking, a nonessential community asset.

PROGRAMS GEARED FOR PAYING PATIENTS AS WELL AS INDIGENT

At this point another question suggests itself: Why does not the hospital make more of an effort to attract more paying patients to meet the competition of the general hospitals, particularly suburban hospitals conveniently located in higher income areas?

The answer to this is that all of the programs are intended to meet the needs of infants and children in the best possible way and thus to "attract" paying patients whose parents wish the best of medical and surgical care for their infants and children despite certain inconveniences of travel.

Since World War II the facilities of the hospital, including a new main building, research center and a modern diagnostic and treatment center (together costing \$5,800,741, \$3,580,335 of it privately donated and \$2,220,406 of it in matching Government funds) have been improved and expanded because the hospital recognized that changing times made it imperative that it equip itself to care for difficult and highly specialized cases in addition to routine cases that would gravitate inevitably to neighborhood hospitals. Thus, it has laid the groundwork for maintaining a reasonable increase in private patient load. But such a program bears fruit slowly.

The medical board of the hospital is active in bringing to the attention of referring physicians the importance of having available an institution qualified to cope with the difficult and complex ailments of children; also the importance of supporting such an institution despite considerations of convenience.

BROADER PUBLIC GIVING WOULD MATCH GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

And, still another question is: Since Children's Hospital is a charitable institution, and, since private givers in the Washington area have proven themselves willing to support it through their donations and bequests, why doesn't the hospital increase its efforts to obtain more such support from the community?

Once again, the answer must be complex rather than simple:

The hospital has indeed increased its efforts over the past 3 years to solicit funds from individuals on the basis of a list of known friends and supporters of the institution. The list of contributors now includes the majority of those individuals who traditionally and in the light of the trend toward unified appeals to support community charity can be expected to support such an institution in addition to their support of unified fund drives and their responsibility to the many other demands made upon their incomes by other worthwhile charitable, educational and cultural institutions and organizations. The next step in any effort to supplement present private support for Children's Hospital charitable work would have to be either a request for an increased level of giving by those who have tradi-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15149

ing infiltrated, as Vietnam is an independent and sovereign country.

Second, there is a complete inadequacy of cooperation with us by allies who ought to be as deeply interested as we. I do not make that statement in any sense of remonstrance, but it is a direction for activity by the United States. The war is Australia's war as much as our own. It intimately threatens Australia's future freedom and security. The war is Malaysia's war. It is a war of the Philippines. It is also a war of Taiwan, or the Republic of China on Taiwan. It also deeply involves Japan. Those are at least some of the nations. It is next door to Taiwan, one of our strongest and firmest allies in that area of the world. An American overture of the most urgent kind is required to obtain cooperation from other nations in Asia.

Third, the success of freedom is involved. Therefore, the job of economic reconstruction in the country of India, the Government of India, and its security against the Chinese Communist incursions—all of these are critically important, just as is the defeat of the effort to subvert the new Government of Malaysia. It is critically important that we make a success in those struggles because they reflect on the whole position in southeast Asia.

Finally, I have great pride in the bipartisan foreign policy forecast and practiced by Arthur Vandenberg, and followed by Eisenhower, Nixon, and the other leaders of our party up until today. I am deeply pledged to it. I intend to stand with it in the policy I have outlined which, I believe, with respect to Vietnam, I am following in the finest traditions, offered for us and our allies, and which has also been joined in on our other side by the late Secretary Cordell Hull and other leaders, along with the late President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD communications I have received from people across the country who thoroughly disagree with U.S. policy in Asia.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up fight against Vietnam fiasco.
Your words make sense.

MIKE SPECTOR.

TACOMA, WASH., June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have done a world of good already by your masterful responses to interrogators Scalley and Rawlson on "Issues and Answers" yesterday. No acknowledgment necessary.
REX S. ROUBERUSH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and support your courageous and well reasoned stand on American policy in southeast Asia.

Dr. and Mrs. RAYMOND.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your appeal for legality, commonsense, and peace on "Issues and Answers."

SIDNEY MEYER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., June 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The country and the world owe you and Senator Gruening a debt which it will never be able to fully repay. Attacking official U.S. policy is many times not only irresponsible but impossible. Irresponsible because those people making policy have access to information not generally known which may greatly influence the solution picked for the problem in question. Impossible because the President, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State are always on the front pages of newspapers and magazines and always on the radio and television news broadcasts. Their opinions and ideas are generally known. The other side often goes unnoticed. We do not always think about the unthinkable. Thus, the administration can much more easily build up their support than can the opposition.

This is the case presently with Vietnam. Here, opposition has been impossible but not irresponsible. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee you have had access to all the administration's information—or at least whatever they have been willing to let you see. Even so, until recently only the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a very few newspapers presented the opposition point of view. The first time that the TV mentioned that you were making speeches on Vietnam was when a channel two reporter, speaking on the progress of the civil rights bill, said that you again interrupted the "debate" to speak on McNamara's war. No mention was made of your reasons for this opposition. Indeed, the way he made mention of your speech was in a contemptuous way—as if you were wasting the time of the Senate.

Recently, however, several newspapers have, at least, mentioned your name. This is a beginning. More people are now talking about Vietnam and when the Senate takes up the foreign aid bill the Vietnam debate will really get going.

I do not support present U.S. policy in Vietnam. I do support taking the issue to the United Nations where it belongs. The war is probably a civil one since not many Communist Chinese or North Vietnamese are directly involved but this may be debatable. How important the war really is to our security and in terms of such intangible things as American lives and material things such as money and arms may also be debatable. But what is not debatable is that our policy toward this war in Vietnam is a part of the larger issue of whether we want for ourselves and our children a world of law, or "liberty and justice for all" or as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address: "A new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved." Or whether we want a world based on the jungle law of military might with "the intoxication of power, constantly increasing and constantly growing subtler. Always at every moment * * * the thrill of victory, the sensation of trampling on an enemy who is helpless. If you want a picture of [this] future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—forever." (George Orwell in "1984.")

The one depends on nations forever taking arms to settle disagreements, the other on an expanded use of international organizations such as the United Nations—to talk, to settle disputes by reason and facts, not force and arms.

At a time when we are extending the boundary of law at home must we leave it in Vietnam? Daniel Webster once said that "whatever government is not a government of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may." Today, I say that whatever world is not a world of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may.

To you, Senator MORSE, and to Senator GRUENING I say please continue to speak out against our unnecessary, illegal, and immoral actions in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

NEIL M. HORWITZ.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

I would also like to take this time to commend you, Senator MORSE, for your stand on civil rights. Few people have ever been as consistently right on so many important issues as you have been. When history records these days it will be seen that you were one of the Senators most responsible for so strong yet just a bill being passed by Congress.

I would like to pose several questions:

1. Under cloture, I thought that only the civil rights bill would be discussed and that, for example, there would be no morning hour or no nongermane speech, even on the Senator's time, would be allowed. Which of these was the intent of the Senate?

2. On Thursday, June 11, 1964 a modified Ervin amendment was passed 80 to 16. It added a new section 1102 to the bill. Under this amendment, if a man commits a crime and has his day in court and then later commits the same crime can he be tried again? If originally he was tried for say, contempt arising under his first crime, can he, for the second crime, be tried for the crime itself?

3. Briefly, if possible, what was the Motorola case?

4. On "The Making of the President, 1960" last week it mentioned your running for President against the then Senator Kennedy. I presume that this was in the Oregon primary. Is this correct and what was the results?

Thank you, Senator MORSE, for letting me take some of your so valuable time. Once again, please continue speaking out against our policy toward the war in Vietnam. Again, thank you very much.

NEIL M. HORWITZ
(Again).

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 14, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you on your remarks concerning the southeast Asia area and situation.

I hope we listen to your advice and bring neutrality and peace to that area instead of destruction.

Keep up your remarks in the interest of peace.

Yours truly,

GARY ALEXANDER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read some of your remarks on our foreign policy in southeast Asia. I believe you are doing a great job. Someone in the Senate has to try to bring some sanity to our policy in that part of the world. If we continue as we are going, South Vietnam will turn, at best, into another Korea.

We are getting in a position of no return. Please keep up your vigorous attacks on our policy in Asia. I, like you, feel we should take our problem to the U.N. If the U.N. isn't good enough for us, it won't be good enough for anyone else. It takes much more than money to keep the U.N. as an effective force. It takes the U.N.'s faith in its machinery, or the U.N. will become just a sight-seeing attraction in New York and follow the footsteps of the League of Nations. George Bernard Shaw either said or quoted someone else who said, "The only thing we

15150

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

learn from history is that we don't learn from history." The time in southeast Asia is growing short.

Please keep up your magnificent efforts. Many Americans are behind you.

Very truly yours,

GILBERT B. FRIEDMAN.

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I live in Vancouver, Canada, and heard your interview with Station CJOR, Monday, June 4. If I was a praying man I would flop down on my knees and thank God that there is a little spark of sanity yet in the United States. Everything you said was exactly according to facts and your estimation as to the solution right now also squares with the development and stage that the world is in, re the newly emerging nations and those waiting to be born, South America, etc.

Your interviewer is still befuddled by cold-war semantics and brainwash. Communism won't overrun or move into any country, no matter how small, until the present way of life has broken down and the people themselves want a change. I'm afraid time is running out on us and we need many more voices like yours with courage and understanding to let their fellow Americans realize that they do not have this holy mission bestowed upon them to force their way of life on the rest of the world. It wasn't humanly possible to make more blunders and mistakes than U.S. internal and foreign policy has and if they pursue this line, we surely face annihilation.

Once more the thanks of many, many thousands of Canadians and surely men of good will all over the world for your brave stand against such great odds.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. E. ENGLE.

ALGONAC, MICH., June 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I compliment you on your true and courageous statements re: our activities in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, etc., today.

It is many a day believe me since we have heard a Senator in U.S. Congress stand up and tell the truth as you did.

It is a terrible thing when any people can no longer trust their government to tell the truth. We are being lied to all along the line.

Scully's argument was really something to behold—i.e., that we should not take the time to take on disgraceful adventure in Vietnam, etc., to the United Nations as that would give "the Communists time to take over."

If the people of Vietnam think communism more suitable to their needs than our famous "free enterprise" which is a polite name for monopoly today, then all our vicious war against those poor people will never change their minds but will only strengthen their hatred of United States as indeed it should.

Scully's assertion that we have not violated our international agreements was sickening and idiotic—he can lie so brazenly because he knows how brainwashed the average American is by monopolistic control of all means of communications.

As for that pathetic creature, Stevenson how can you adequately express the contempt any citizen can feel for him.

But thoughtful people are profoundly thankful for men like you and Senator GRUENING and a few others (how pitifully few) and I'll bet your words today will be heard around the world.

More power to you my dear sir, if we survive as a nation with any self-respect at all

It will be because of men like you, not little bootlickers like Adlai Stevenson. What a figure he cuts before the U.N.

In sincere appreciation of your honest efforts on behalf of country.

D. FLORENCE FAGG.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I enjoyed your viewpoint on Vietnam on "Face the Nation."

Would like to see you appear on other networks.

Mrs. KATHERINE BERMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to thank you for the fine stand you have taken on the Vietnam situation that we are now unfortunately involved in. To begin with, our Government (or CIA) has no right infringing on other people's rights of self-determination. Then, to claim that there are foreign invaders, that the people ask for defense, and to go ahead and perpetuate a war fraught with dictatorships, torture, lies, and misinformation to the American people is a terrible disgrace. Please continue your fine work.

Sincerely,

DREW LANGSNER.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,

June 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: We fully support your views as expressed on "Face the Nation" with regard to the war we are conducting against South Vietnam. We believe that in view of the pressures exerted for our Government greater participation in South Vietnam (as witness program of June 14, Marguerite Higgins, etc.), it is imperative that you repeat your talk on TV in the very near future before we as a nation become embroiled beyond recall in a nuclear all-out war.

In profound appreciation for your humanity and sanity.

Respectfully,

Mrs. G. BLOOM.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire the moral patriotic stand you have taken on the dirty little war in Indo-China. Long may you teach the people.

JAMES DUGAN.

MOORESTOWN, N.J.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I heard your broadcast on ABC radio June 28 and am in agreement with your thoughts on the Vietnam situation. I support your efforts to advance your foreign policy philosophy and as a private citizen will be glad to aid you in any way I can.

Sincerely,

EMALIE M. SMITH.

DEAR SENATOR: I listened to you on the TV program today. You were great. Now if you could be seen by more people on TV or be quoted in the managed press.

With best wishes,

ZACK KORN.

ANDOVER, MASS.

June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Do keep plugging for meeting at United Nations to help keep the peace.

Very truly,

EDITH KITCHIN.

P.S.—Saw you on TV last night.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a former resident of the Pacific Northwest I am proud to congratulate you on your civilized stand on the Vietnam war.

Regards,

D. S. HERSKOWITZ.

NEWTON PUEBLO, COLO.

SIR: Admiring your talk on today's program, please keep up the good work. It was with the keenest appreciation that I listened to you. Somebody has to speak out and trust you will continue to do so. I'm no pacifist nor the other way either although I have 10 years' service under my belt. I see no earthly use of sending more troops to Saigon or any other place over there.

J. E. WICKERYOU.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I listened to your interview with Nancy Dickerson of NBC's "Today" program this morning—subject of "The War in Vietnam," and I want to say my husband and I agree with every word you spoke.

More power to you and may you have some influence to stop our country from trying to police the entire Asian Continent.

We can't dictate to our neighbors and I think as a country (of which we are proud) we should quit trying to dictate the policies of other nations.

Mrs. WM. SCHUCHART.

DEARBORN, MICH., June 26, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you on your stand on South Vietnam. We listened to you on the "Today" show and also FRANK CHURCH with the opposite view. We need more people like you to point the way back to our country's basic principles and our Constitution, especially to younger people in public office—FRANK CHURCH. Our Constitution perhaps should be read in its entirety to each Senator every 6 months or so.

We are with you all the way too on the failure of the United States to utilize the United Nations. Most smaller nations and most Americans probably wonder why it hasn't been used.

Congratulations again and best wishes for great success in your stand.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. RAY E. GOEBORO.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,

June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been wanting to congratulate you for quite some time concerning your enlightened opinions on foreign policy. I certainly hope you continue to work as effectively as you know how towards a more realistic Vietnam policy, and other policies.

It is a pleasure to read your speeches in various magazines. It is indeed a shame that the newspapers don't hardly give you any coverage.

You have my deepest gratitude for your courageous work.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN FREEMAN.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,

June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We hope you keep pounding away at the idea of bringing the Vietnam situation before the United Nations.

I am occasionally asked to speak before groups on behalf of the U.N. The question that is often put to me—even by U.N. skeptics—is:

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Here is a threat to world peace. Can't the U.N. at least discuss the issue?
My best wishes.

D. L. MARTIN.

JUNE 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very much in agreement with the stand you took with regard to the war in Vietnam.

I doubt very much if we are making any true friends there in Vietnam and around the world by our presence there. Many people are shocked by our indiscriminate bombing with napalm and threats of atomic warfare. We have defended the tyranny of Diem and bought our way in at that. The people are tired of war and by our presence there it will prolong the strife and agony for years to come.

We should remember what France paid in lives and money for years without any gain. I doubt if we will get any other countries to go along with us in this war.

Let's take a long-range look at the situation. As you have said, the best thing we can do now is go to the U.N. This makes sense to me and the only wise move we can make at this time.

We need more men of stature to stand up to the hotheads and the uninformed. We need to make some long-range plans and "think the unthinkable."

Sincerely,

DON LINDERMAN.

P.S.—I am an ex-constituent of yours, 28 years in Oregon.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to tell you that we heard you on the "Today Show" and we appreciate your stand on the Vietnam problem. If we had 99 more men like you in the Senate and 435 in the House with your convictions the rest of us humble citizens could rid ourselves of our national guilt and shame.

We should understand that communism is an ideology and cannot be detained with bullets. The Romans tried to suppress the Christians and failed. The Christians tried to suppress the Moslems and they flourished faster than ever. Now the Christians are trying to suppress communism and for every Communist they detain abroad, four Communists in sympathy are generated at home.

For many long years these poor people in southeast Asia have tried to rid themselves of foreign impostors and now we, the most destructive of them all, are in there to ruin their land and homes. If we don't get out our Democratic Party is going down to defeat this fall election.

Please Senator, more of the same, you have millions of right-thinking people back of you.

Yours sincerely,

E. P. LEVINE.

GLENDALE, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have listened to your courageous talks against war several times with great admiration, but have not been courageous enough myself to write to you. Your views on this unbelievable action in Southeast Asia and mine seem to be alike.

Not only do I object to sending young American men there to die, but I object to their (or our) killing and burning those poor miserable people of Vietnam and Laos. Like you, I am very critical of my government, and certainly do not support President Johnson's actions. I believe that President Kennedy grew with his position as president and would never have gone this far— even under pressure.

I am not only critical of this vicious be-

haviour—not only in Southeast Asia, but Cuba and South America—I am downright ashamed of it. But, thank God, in you we have a man who is not afraid to speak out. I hope everyone heard you speak on NBC today. Bless you, sir, and good heart to you.
Very sincerely,

MARGARET DORNHAUSER.

STONEWALL, OKLA.,

June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I do not know how many people, I have heard say amen to every word that you said on NBC's "Today." I suggested we write and tell you how proud we had a man in the Senate that would stand on his two feet and tell the American people the truth about this (Vietnam) situation. Get our boys out of there, but they all said that it would be paper for your wastebasket.

This is one thing that could defeat President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

FRED McKEEL.

GENEVA, N.Y., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
House of Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HON. AND DEAR SIR: Thank you for your forthright and courageous statement about the situation in southeast Asia. We are certainly going headlong into something which will lead to disaster and a war which can be unending, and become a worldwide conflagration. What has become of President Kennedy's assertion, "that we do not fear to negotiate but we will not negotiate out of fear." The conference table is the place of wisdom. I am convinced now before it is too late. Some way must be found to organize minority opinion on this grave matter. Can you get someone to take the lead? Keep up your efforts.

Faithfully yours,

MELVIN ABSON,

Retired.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: A foolish woman once insulted you by saying you had been kicked in the head by a horse. If I could offer one suggestion for the future of American foreign policy, it would be: Find that horse and set him loose in the Department of State.

I listened to your presentation on the ABC television program "Issues and Answers" earlier this afternoon and then tuned in the NBC "Open Mind" program entitled "The Crisis in Vietnam." In your half hour you made more sense on Vietnam and southeast Asia generally than the whole gang on "Open Mind"—including a Princeton professor, a pair of journalists (one foreign, one domestic), a foreign policy scholar, and the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Vietnamese Affairs—were able to achieve in 60 dreary minutes. Particularly valuable was your suggestion for combining a SEATO peacekeeping force with an emergency United Nations meeting, to be followed by a special UN force in that troubled land. Here is a way for us to oppose a Communist takeover without resorting to a dime-store Machiavellianism that flouts our charter commitments to the United Nations, defies moral principle, offends Africa and Asia and Latin America, alarms our allies, tantalizes our enemies, and threatens a nuclear holocaust.

Who can tell whether your suggestions will be followed? I for one am grateful that they have been given.

Whether this Nation hears or whether it forebears, keep speaking up. Robert M. La Follette, who came into the Senate 60 years

ago next January, had to entitle one chapter of his autobiography "Alone in the Senate." A giant can stand alone when necessary.

Persist.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE KOSKI.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sending you this page from the Cleveland Plain Dealer to let you know that there are a good many people throughout this country who think as you do about the Vietnam question, and who back you 100 percent in your effort to prevent a war over there.

Keep on expressing yourself in this matter. More power to you.

Sincerely,

ADA N. LEFFINGWELL.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

OPEN LETTER AD ASKS VIET NEGOTIATIONS

An open letter to the State Department, signed by 69 Clevelanders from all walks of life and urging negotiations instead of stepped-up war in Vietnam, is published in the Plain Dealer today as a paid advertisement.

The letter's publication has been timed to coincide with a foreign policy conference here today in which the State and Defense Departments are participating.

"The signatures are of those persons we could readily reach within the last 10 days," said Sheldon D. Clark, Cleveland lawyer and initiator of the open letter.

"In my talks with fellow Clevelanders it was felt that a statement to the officials of the two Departments at this time afforded the best means of expressing ourselves as forcibly as we know how," Clark said.

Scheduled to attend the all-day conference in Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland are George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, and John T. McNaughton of the Defense Department, Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs.

Among the signers of the open letter are Dr. Benjamin Spock of Western Reserve University, an authority on child development; the Reverend Alan J. Davis, pastor of Aldersgate Methodist Church; the Reverend Dennis G. Kuby, pastor of Unitarian Society of Cleveland; Paul Olynik of Penn College, an advocate of a sane nuclear policy; Harold J. Quigley, leader of the Cleveland Ethical Society; Jack G. Day, lawyer, active in civil rights cases; Sam Sponseller, retired labor leader, and Oscar H. Steiner, businessman.

Money for the ad was raised by those who signed the open letter, Clark said.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 18, 1964]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE—NEEDED: AN APPROACH TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The United States is a foreign party to a civil war in Vietnam. Fifteen thousand U.S. uniformed personnel have been committed to the battle. Casualties include American soldiers.

Acceleration of the American war effort in South Vietnam invites increased aid by China to the Communist Vietnamese. Stepping up the war effort risks the use by either side of nuclear arms. Nuclear war offers no victory. What is the alternative?

Negotiation is urged by Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Ernest Gruening, Columnist Walter Lippmann and others. Recognizing it takes both sides to make peace, we urge our Government to initiate a conference of nations to guarantee a neutral Vietnam. We support U.S. efforts to insure enforcement of agreements. The United Nations can assist direct negotiation. Inspection teams must

15152

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

be free to operate wherever needed. They can be backed by frontier patrols. The best guarantee of enforcement is the mutual advantage of the agreement. The goal is a Vietnam whose independence is guaranteed and respected.

Robert R. Archer, Professor; Raymond S. Beard, Business Counselor; Marguerite S. Bellamy, Housewife; Keith C. Billman, Social Worker; Evelyn A. Blackburn, Insurance Agent; Isabel N. Bliss, Homemaker; William M. Bliss, Engineer; Edith O. Brashares, College Instructor; Edwin A. Brown, Minister; Rillma Buckman, Sociologist; Bronson P. Clark, Businessman; Sheldon D. Clark, Lawyer; Lila Cornell, Homemaker; Marie F. Cotton, Homemaker; Wendell P. Cotton, Salesman; Natalie C. Crouter, Housewife; Elfrieda S. Dalber, Secretary; Alan J. Davis, Minister; Hortense M. Davis, Teacher; Jack G. Day, Lawyer; Steven Deutsch, University Faculty; Mort Epstein, Designer; Gail R. Gann, Homemaker; Donald S. Gann, Surgeon; Joel M. Garver, Lawyer; Paul Gitlin, Social Worker; Henry Gluck, Psychologist; William F. Hellmuth, Jr., professor; Arnold A. Herzog, Lawyer; Fred Husa, Office Worker; Sidney D. Josephs, Businessman; Mrs. Harry Kirtz, Homemaker; Waldo H. Kliever, Consultant; Dennis G. Kubly, Minister; Jerome Landfield, College Professor; Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George Levinger, Educator; John P. Marhevka, Male Hair Stylist; Mrs. Edward A. Marshall, Homemaker; Charles R. Miller, Lawyer; Paul I. Miller, Professor; Hans F. Mueller, Retired; Laura Mueller, Homemaker; Sarah B. Nenner, Housewife; James M. Newman, Advertising; Paul Olynky, Professor; Clyde Onyett, Public Relations; William W. Outland, Order Analyst; Samuel Prellwitz, Industrial Research; Harold J. Quigley, Minister; Willard C. Richan, Educator; Eldon P. Roe, Merchant; Marian Rosenberg, Social Worker; Ralph Rudd, Lawyer; Audrey Sabadosh, Librarian; Nicholas Sabadosh, Teacher; Wilmer L. Satterthwait, Painter; Vera A. Schwartz, Legal Secretary; A. L. Sherwin, Lawyer; Frank Spigel, Lawyer; Benjamin Spock, Physician; Sam Sponseller, Retired; Vera Smisek, Teacher; Oscar H. Steiner, Businessman; Helen Stewart, High School Counselor; Edward A. Taubert, Photographer; Warren E. Thompson, Educator; Hugh Tyson, Graduate Student; Harry O. Way, Bacteriologist.

(This statement paid for by the signers.)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,

June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my deep appreciation for the position you have consistently taken on the Vietnam situation? It seems you are one of very few in the Senate who have taken this position, yet I believe most of the American people stand with you.

It seems, sometimes, that the administration has been goaded into its position by the Birchites, etc. It can't be good politics and it certainly is not good foreign policy. The U.N. may have some business there but not the United States. If these people are to be saved from communism what are they to be saved for? Another Madame Nhu?

In our country's foreign policy does every other country have to be either capitalist or Communist? What's wrong with letting them decide. If they decide to try some socialistic form of government then that is their business. I simply cannot subscribe to the thinking that our system is synonymous with right and that their system is synonymous with wrong. Why do we want to keep on being ugly Americans in the eyes

of most of the citizens of the world? We have been unsuccessful in making law-abiding citizens out of Mississippians (and others). Who do we think we are in telling southeast Asia how to live? A war there may never be lost but it is certain it would never be won.

Please continue to do all in your power to let the President and others in positions of responsibility know what you think is right for America during these times.

In appreciation,

TED H. CRABTREE.

P.S.—My typing is at least as good as my spelling.

ALLEGAN, MICH., June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Have seen you many times on TV but the issue of the Vietnam war June 25 was right to the point; we are all with you here. Why do they use this issue as a political football during this election campaign? We are certainly losing ground on all America was founded on. Don't we have enough red-blooded American Senators that would take a stand with you? Have you ever thought of running for the Presidency? I believe you would do a good job for us—would like to see more of you on TV.

Sincerely,

MARIE C. SMITH.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are right in everything you said about the war in Vietnam. This is a United Nations and SEATO problem—not ours. We have no business policing Asia. My son is over there and I want him home. I hope you win your point and I am not alone. I can produce dozens of families that feel as I do. We are sticking our nose into other people's troubles and have enough of our own. God bless you.

PATRICIA M. FRAZER.

P.S.—I saw you on "Today Show" this a.m. You were wonderful but makes my heart bleed to think of another war.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: So many of my friends and I want to commend you on your stand on "our" war in Vietnam and Laos. There is enough to work for here at home besides interfering in civil wars on the other side of the world.

Keep up the good work.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANCES G. BERLIN.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your appearance on the "Today" show, Thursday, June 24 was sensational. I wish every man and woman in America could have heard you. In the past I have seldom agreed with you, but today I stood up at my breakfast table and cheered. Thank you, sir.

Mrs. E. J. KESSLER.

JUNE 26, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After hearing you talk on the "Today" show, June 25, I just want to tell you what you said makes sense in my opinion. I hope and pray that more Congressmen take the same position.

On the "Today" show they announced after your interview that Senator CHURCH would be on the next day to give a different view of the situation but after hearing Senator CHURCH this morning it seems to me that he has just about the same opinion of the situation in southeast Asia that you have. With all the problems in this country that we don't seem to be able to cope with I don't think we should be over on the other side of the world trying to solve problems.

Jack Lescouille on the "Today" show said it was surprising to him that people didn't seem to know or care about this problem we have taken on as ours in southeast Asia, of course those are not his exact words but that was the general idea he was talking about. It is a shame that more of our people cannot be awakened to the need to be actively interested in what their lawmakers are doing. I am very thankful to the "Today" show for trying to help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GLADYS BRANDHUBER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your position opposing the present involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia and further extension of such involvement.

I urge you to carry your opposition and viewpoint aggressively to the people via every means of communication possible. It is only such voices as yours that can prevent the United States from further violation of international law and treaties.

Respectfully yours,

D. W. MILLER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 24, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my sincere gratitude for your courageous efforts in opposing our Government's policy in South Vietnam.

Your vocal expressions are the only optimistic note in this unbelievable mess.

Mrs. ALLAN F. SKLADER.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH.,

June 24, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I surely agree with your talk over the "Today" program on the talk you gave over the air. You are a 100-percent American and you are certainly right on your Red China stand.

Stop and think what it will mean to have any war of any kind.

Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. DICK.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard you this morning on "Today" and I think you are absolutely right. It is an outrage to send our boys to be killed in Asia. We stick our noses in too many countries and the money we pour into Communist countries is outrageous. If I had a son, I think I would rather he died a natural death than to send him to Vietnam. Do keep up your work and try and curb the ridiculous spending of life and money outside of the United States.

Sincerely,

HELEN STIRTSMAN.

P.S.—My husband was mayor of Plainfield in 1929 and judge of the district court; were he alive, he would agree with you.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,

June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I have just finished listening to you on the "Today" television show. We are so grateful to find we still have a statesman in our Government, and not just all individuals striving for their own political gain.

I have never been able to understand why the world seemed to condone the fact that we got up in arms when Cuba based another country's warmaking machinery on Cuba's soil, when the United States is parked on

1964

practically everyone's doorstep. This to me is just not fair reasoning.

We have two sons serving in the Armed Forces at the present time. One a young ensign on the U.S.S. *Dominant*, in the Mediterranean, and the other a private first class, in Germany. Our young next door neighbor is now in Valley Forge Hospital from injuries received in Vietnam, so these scattered "bon-fires" are very real to us.

If there is anything that you know of that average citizens can do to help you get this problem into the United Nations and on into the right channels, we shall be very glad to help.

Thank you again for sharing your enlightened wisdom with us.

Very truly yours,

KATHRYN BROADMAN
Mrs. David Broadman.

EXCELSIOR, MINN., June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE E. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to tell you how gratifying it was to hear your brave words on the "Today" program this morning. I agree with every word you said, and I only wish that your voice could reach the White House and the State Department.

Sending General Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam is certainly not a step toward peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL F. KIESEL.

WITHEE, WIS., June 25, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard your wonderful talk on the "Today" program over NBC. I heartily agree that our boys should not be in Vietnam. A little 4-year-old said to me "if you vote for a Democrat it means war." How can we change that picture and idea? I have voted Democratic since F.D.R. and I would like to be proud of my party, but how when we do the things that you outlined in your talk. May you have the courage, money, and stamina to keep airing these views.

My heart is in this. I have a son leaving for Korea in July.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARTIN KESKIMAKI.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have a feeling that yours must be a bitter and lonely lot—now in the first aftermath of the Asian crisis and your sublime response to it. I put these few words on paper because I hope to dilute by an infinitesimal amount the abuse probably inflicted on you. I hope that you understand that at least in the academic communities that you are a prophet with honor. Also that yours is not the ephemeral kind that comes and goes with political campaigns. It is of the type that will be deeply engraven in the records of the history of our times. I do not and cannot speak for the existing guild of historians, but I have sufficient experience to know that if there is a future—better than radioactive debris, you will be recorded as one of its major achievers. You may be pleased to know that at least among my colleagues, each new crisis evoked by our insane stance leads us to say, almost instinctively that "Senator Morse will take a stand."

I wish that there was some simple, direct way to convey to you the admiration that I feel for your discharge of your high office. Were I a deeply religious person, it could be put as: "Thank God for WAYNE MORSE." As it is, there is only the statement, the historians will write your name in the lot

of those who deserved the most of the countrymen.

Respectfully,

ROBERT G. COLODNY,
Associate Professor, History.

FORT WAYNE, IND.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Heard part of your discussion of South Vietnam and southeast Asia and TV this morning in answer to questions by newscasters.

Most erudite, most reasonable, most logical, and factual discussion I have heard and the most authoritative devoid of emotionalism and politics.

It was also a brave explanation. You will be accused of everything and a lesser light might even be accused of aiding the Communists if he had said the things you did.

Also, your solutions are based on the Christian spirit of which our country boasts.

I want to say that I wish we had more men and women fearless enough and intelligent enough and moral enough to fight for the things in southeast Asia and our role there as you have done.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONLEY, M.D.

HINSDALE, ILL., June 25, 1964.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your position and public statement relative to the Vietnam situation.

It is indeed disturbing in time of peace, in a country in which "only Congress shall declare war," to have our Communist riddled State Department "arrange the war," as I firmly believe they also did with Japan prior to Pearl Harbor.

Is China such a threat to Russia that our pink darlings feel that it is our duty to take them "off the hook," or are they afraid that if Russia became entangled with China, that the Red satellites may get an opportunity to free themselves?

For God's sake, do all possible to put the management of our country back in the hands of our representatives, and out of the hands of our damnable State Department.

Again, my thanks for men of your courage.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. REDIEHS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was very good hearing you today on "Issues and Answers." Thank you for representing the American people's side on the war in Vietnam.

With all good and kind wishes.

LUCILLE OSTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I would like to thank you for your courageous stand on South Vietnam. Most people that I know think it is a messy situation, but say they don't know enough to write or sign petitions. There is a news-blackout here, and your views are not heard. Continue the good work.

MISS CHARLOTTE GRANT.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
June 28, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

SIR AND GENTLEMAN: According to Pittsburgh Press, "Washington Calling," column,

June 28, 1964, printed the following statement: "Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon Democrat, who disagrees with administration's Vietnam policy, is getting close attention from Communist news agencies. When he said he was convinced 'the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States,' the Communists broadcast his remark."

Mr. WAYNE MORSE, when I enter the voting booth I vote independently of party labels or tags. But I do say, and have said ever since World War I, that the United States, as today's reading of events and actions since World War I, to the present day and time proves such a charge as most correct in all details. And, Mr. MORSE, you don't have to be a Communist to see that.

Instead of maintaining and expanding not only our respectability and leadership among the nations of the world's people, we as a nation have, and are, becoming a nation that is despised and hated by the world's exploited, robbed, and murdered peoples, that was and is being accelerated by the hour, by and through the "cloak and dagger" organization—the CIA.

Our Constitution which may not be the acme and omega of perfection, nevertheless, is being torn asunder and our personal liberties being obliterated one by one, every day. We do not legislate by law today. We legislate by committees, witch hunters, and inquisition, and thereby traveling the very same highway that Rome trod, and will meet the same destruction.

In other words, we are fiddling while the United States burns.

In closing, be prepared to be maligned, ridiculed, slandered, and reviled, even impeached, if not murdered, if you stand by your guns, which is a fact.

America as a country, is great, grand, and beautiful. But surely is badly managed. And the present management better soon be changed to a better one. Or there won't be anything worth, or too manage.

I have been watching—and remonstrating—at the hypocritical, wasteful destruction of this country's resources and produced wealth since the year 1884 and the only difference from then to now is we are traveling down the slope to chaos faster than logs down a mountain side.

These are times that try men's souls. Are you and some others just summer soldiers, or are you made up of the materials that stand the heat of battle? I hope so, but time will tell.

Most respectfully yours,

CHAS. A. FRANCIS.

PASSAIC, N.J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you on TV Sunday and I want you to know how wholeheartedly I agree with you on foreign policy and especially on the trouble in Vietnam.

I was alarmed when I read in the New York Times this morning that President Johnson said in Minneapolis that the United States, "when necessary," would not hesitate to "risk war" to preserve the peace.

In my opinion that would be no peace.

Thank you for the wonderful work you are doing in the Senate. I only wish there were many more like you, Senator HUMPHREY and Senator FULBRIGHT, and others.

Very sincerely yours,

MISS HERTHA LINGG.

ELIZABETH, N.J.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just heard WABC's "Issues and Answers" and several weeks ago, I watched WCBS's "Face the Nation." I am certainly pleased that somebody in your

July 1

position has the "guts" to expound your philosophy of foreign policy even though many of your colleagues will not publicly approve of your comments and evaluations. I certainly agree with practically everything you mentioned on both programs. I am not too sure that the United Nations is the complete solution, however, I feel it would be superior to the current U.S. unilateral military action in Vietnam and elsewhere, including the U.S. planes in Laos.

It is comforting to know that we share the same opinions on the use of volunteers in McNamara's war, using SEATO allies in a peacekeeping role in Vietnam and the realization that the Vietnam puppets "we" set up are not as effective as the Nhu family. It was certainly a shame to see Madame Nhu's predictions about coups, etc., during her visit to the United States last year, become tragic realities several months later.

I am quite concerned about the outcome of the Far Eastern situation since I have very dear friends in the Philippines who occasionally travel in Thailand, Japan, etc. on U.N., Philippine Government and Philippine atomic energy matters. However, I repeat that I feel the U.S. actions are wrong and illegal.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES S. MCKARNS.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,

June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: With General Taylor going to South Vietnam it can mean one thing only.

I would like to know why Americans are the only ones sent to Vietnam?

Why are not other countries trying to help out over there?

Generals want war to add to their glory, but the mothers, wives and sweethearts of the American men do not want war.

Can you do something to stop the warmongers from exploiting our men over there.

We have lost too many men already.

Thank you for your consideration,

J. MIMNAUGH.

JUNE 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senior Senator of Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It was with great interest that I listened to your statements on today's "Issues and Answers." I share your opinion concerning our actions in southeast Asia 100 percent and I hope that enough people will have listened to you so that they snap out of their blind indifference and complacency to tolerate the brinkmanship of the Pentagon.

I understand that the Senate has the right to vote for or against the appointment of an ambassador. Why then don't you show through your vote that you disapprove strongly this newest move of appointing the Chief of Staff of our military forces to an ambassadorship, a move which throughout the world can have only one meaning? I suppose that Senator FULBRIGHT has similar views.

If you two and some other reasonable men who like you, watch with deep concern our silthring into a new war, would take an energetic stand maybe it could stop Mr. Johnson to put his trust so completely in Mr. McNamara.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS F. LUCAS.

GLENVIEW, ILL.,

June 28, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your remarks on the television program, "Issues and Answers," today. While we believe in the

ideals of the Democratic Party and have long voted for its candidates, my family and I have been greatly disappointed in the policy being used in the Far East. We have had a part in and have seen what happens in war, especially since the Second World War, and we believe in and support as we can the United Nations with all its operations as our best hope for the world. We have never been able to understand why the United States has not tried the United Nations for the Far Eastern troubles. We hope that there is still a chance for President Johnson to change his course and try. Surely, at this point, he is carrying us more slowly than the Republicans would, but nevertheless, into war without trying the United Nations' machinery for keeping the peace.

Thank you again for your remarks today. I am writing our great Senator, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, to this effect.

Respectfully yours,

RUTH M. FELTON

Mrs. Ruth M. Felton.

JUNE 27, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Among many other concerned Americans I am deeply grateful to you for your forthright questioning of our self-defeating un-American policies in southeast Asia. It is hard for me to understand how our Government can be so shortsighted as to believe that our prestige and influence in Asia can be increased by policies of a sort that were discredited even before World War II, and which—as you note—have been declared illegal under a variety of international agreements.

Has it ever occurred to you that by designating our regional alliances as specifically against "Communist" aggression and expansion that we have unconsciously reproduced the pre-World War II Axis "anti-Comintern Pact"? The U.S. Government condemned this Axis Pact as designed to hide their own aggressive and expansionist aims. I very much fear that our own anti-Communist pacts seem similarly aggressive and expansionist to many governments which reject communism for their own societies. During the formation of the SEATO, for example, the Asian governments deplored the U.S. emphasis on military force to "contain communism" and urged policies for economic development.

I am venturing to enclose some letters to the Times I've written on this issue. Some have been published, some not. Our Government's distortions of the record are truly shocking. Please keep pressing the issue. We, the American people, seem increasingly to be pushed into the role of robot—rather than the informed electorate on which our democracy rests.

With appreciation,

Sincerely,

HELEN MEARS.

APRIL 17, 1964.

To the EDITOR of the NEW YORK TIMES:

A Times' editorial (April 16), headed "Blood Sport" began: "A deranged youth steps out on an Albany hotel ledge. Twelve stories below, crowds urge him to jump. Not to a net's safety. To death. What kind of people can become such a mob? How can adults yell 'chicken' and 'yellow' to another human dangling on the lip of danger?"

Yes. But a more urgent question is how can some of our leading citizens cry chicken to our Government and urge it to carry out bombing attacks against North Vietnam? How can our Government, in effect, say yellow to the Vietnamese who want a U.S.-maintained fratricidal slaughter stopped? Not long ago the Times published a wirephoto from South Vietnam showing a small child hideously burned by napalm supplied by the

United States, and dropped from a U.S.-supplied plane, piloted by a young American. Many of our most respected citizens tell us we must continue such activities or lose prestige. Others calmly debate whether a bombing attack against North Vietnam would be good or bad as an election gimmick.

The Times editorial concluded: "Disregard for another's life—by inertia or, worse, by goading—takes civilized people back to the cave. Does the attitude of that Albany mob bespeak a way of life for many Americans? If so, the bell tolls for all of us."

The Times says it better than I can, but it addresses its feeling of shock at the gnat. The lesser evil. It is the camel, national policy, that is truly frightening. If disregard for human life is ugly for the man-in-the-street, it is infinitely uglier at the level of national policy. Whether consciously or unconsciously our attitudes are influenced by those of our Nation's leaders. Our leaders have chosen the caveman's club, rather than the civilized men's tools of negotiation, arbitration, conciliation. In Vietnam our whole nation is the mob. And the bell is tolling.

HELEN MEARS.

JUNE 15, 1964.

To the EDITOR of the NEW YORK TIMES:

In his column of June 3, C. L. Sulzberger declared that the SEATO alliance was no help in carrying out U.S. policy in Vietnam, and concluded that: "We must therefore face the problem of salvaging our Indochina crisis on the basis of what we consider right * * *. In southeast Asia we must honor our commitments and respect our interest."

Most Americans would surely agree with Mr. Sulzberger that the U.S. Government should "honor our commitments." The difficulty is that by now the U.S. Government has made so many directly conflicting commitments that it literally cannot be faithful to all of them.

The United States is committed, under the U.N. Charter, not to use force save in the common interest. No U.N. resolution has ever requested, or authorized, U.S. military aid in South Vietnam.

The U.S. Government was further committed by the Geneva Accord of 1954 not to send modern military equipment, not to send additional military advisers, and certainly not to send 16,000 "miscellaneous military, many of them to actual combat, disguised as "advisers." Mr. Sulzberger actually quotes the late Secretary of State Dulles as telling him, in February 1955 that: "The Geneva * * * accord bars the importation into Indochina of new military aid. The United States of America can't increase the number of its military advisers."

The United States was, at least morally, committed to accept the result of a nationwide election to be held throughout Vietnam in 1956. The United States backed the decision of Ngo Dinh Diem not to hold the election.

The United States was committed to support Diem as the "legally elected President of the Republic of Vietnam." When Diem was overthrown by a military coup—with at least indirect encouragement from the United States, the United States at once committed itself to the new regime. When that regime was overthrown by another military coup the United States at once committed itself to it.

Increasingly since late 1960, the U.S. Government has committed itself to the war effort in South Vietnam. Of all the commitments this appears to be the one the U.S. Government chooses to honor.

Is a commitment to a war effort in Vietnam the sort of commitment Americans in general would choose to honor above prior commitments to seek solutions by negotiation, arbitration, mediation, and by techniques spelled out in the U.N. Charter.

In a presidential election year, in a democracy, isn't this the sort of question that should be debated?

HELEN MEARS.

RUSK DISPUTED ON VIETNAM—GENEVA ACCORDS FORBID INDEPENDENT ENTITY IN SOUTH, WRITER STATES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his press conference (the Times, Nov. 9) Secretary of State Rusk, responding to a question about Vietnam, said: "The other side was fully committed—fully committed—in the original Geneva settlement of 1954 to the arrangements, which provided for South Vietnam as an independent entity."

This is a puzzling statement. The record seems to prove that not only did the Geneva agreements of 1954 not provide for South Vietnam as an independent entity, but expressly forbade such a development. Article 8 of the final declaration says of Vietnam that "the military demarcation line should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary . . ." The 17th parallel was chosen merely as a cease-fire line to separate the opposing military forces.

The agreements specifically provided that Vietnam should be unified by nationwide elections in 1956. These facts are acknowledged in a State Department pamphlet "A Threat to the Peace," published in December 1961, which gives the U.S. official position about the Vietnam problem at that time. The pamphlet explains why the Diem government refused to carry out the agreement to hold the scheduled election, and why the U.S. Government backed Diem's position. The State Department wrote: "It was the Communists' calculation that nationwide elections scheduled in the accords for 1956 would turn all of Vietnam over to them."

It is profoundly disturbing to find our own Government rewriting history. It is not easy to see how our Government can encourage adherence to international agreements by ignoring them.

HELEN MEARS.

NEW YORK, November 11, 1963.

VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL URGED—EVENTS BELIEVED TO INDICATE NEITHER LEADERS NOR PEOPLE WANT OUR HELP

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES: Reporting to the House Armed Services Committee on January 27, Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

"In the case of South Vietnam our help is clearly wanted, and we are deeply engaged in supporting the Vietnamese Government and people in their war against the Communist Vietcong."

Surely Secretary McNamara meant to say "our help is clearly not wanted," for almost as he was speaking the Government which presumably wanted "our help" to keep fighting was overthrown by another military coup, and the Times reported this event in headlines which read: "Vietnam Junta Ousted by Military Dissidents Who Fear 'Neutrality'."

In other words, the generals whom our Government supported in their coup to replace the Diem government which was beginning to "flirt with neutrality" began in turn to incline toward the same policy. If anything seems "clear" in this grim situation it is that our Government is finding it increasingly difficult to find even military leaders who "clearly want our help" to continue their fratricidal strife.

As for the Vietnamese people, it has never been their war. If reports in the Times (and our newswEEKlies) have made anything clear, it is that the Vietnamese people have supported the war so little that a ruthless policy of forcing them into fortified villages was introduced to prevent them from helping the guerrilla fighters. And the so-called Vietcong may or may not be Communists,

or pro-Communist, but they are unquestionably Vietnamese.

LACK OF OUTCRY

The situation in Vietnam is so unworthy of us that the apparent lack of popular outcry against it suggests a condition of indifference and moral callousness few of us would have believed possible only a few years ago. It is this growing apathy and callousness that is the true enemy of the "values we hold dear."

The U.S. Government should at once present the problem of Vietnam to the U.N. Security Council, and should withdraw our military advisers and stop providing millions of dollars a day to keep a war going.

If our leadership means only destruction and death for the people who live in distant areas our commentators call "strategic real estate," our Nation will go down in history as just another rampaging great power, self-convinced that our might makes right. And it will not be the Communists who will have betrayed us. It will have been ourselves.

HELEN MEARS.

NEW YORK, January 31, 1964.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN
HERITAGE ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Our association has directed that we commend you on your firm and critical stand against the policies of our Government in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Our organization associates itself with you in the proposition (1) that the role of our Government played in the South Vietnamese situation endangers world peace and the whole of mankind itself; (2) should be immediately referred to the United Nations.

Moreover, Sir, we think it strange that the Government of the United States can involve itself in police action for "freedom in South Vietnam" and cannot involve itself in Mississippi and the Southern States with police action to preserve freedom, the Bill of Rights, and the right of every citizen to vote. We are certain that Afro-Americans, people of African descent, colonial peoples everywhere look with grave misgivings on this strange contradiction. We are certain that more and more democratic-minded people everywhere will question the role of our Government and the American people as representing a nation devoted to preserving freedom and democracy in the world.

A copy of this letter in support of your views is being forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Representatives in Congress. We urge you to hold fast and endure to the end that our Nation and its people not become the perpetrators of a world thermonuclear war.

Yours truly,

ISHMAEL FLORY,
Director of Organization.

(Cc: Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, Washington, D.C.; Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.; Senators Paul Douglas and Everett Dirksen; Congressmen William L. Dawson, Charles Diggs, Augustus Hawkins, Robert Nix, Adam Powell.)

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Heard you on the "Today" show this morning. You voice the stand that I have thought we should take. What can we do to stop the present program? Are we big enough to say we made a mistake?

E.J.D.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: How wonderful your stand on Vietnam—saw you on TV program "Today." I thoroughly concur with you and hope for

more Americans to know the truth about this.

MISS SAKI DIKRAN.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Thank God for Senators like you and the work you are doing toward stopping the horrible war in Vietnam.

MRS. ESTHER METLIZ.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At a meeting of 100 women held at Mapleton Park Synagogue, Brooklyn, on June 25, 1964, it was firmly stated that we agree wholeheartedly with your stand on Vietnam. We should never have gone there. We urge your further demonstration of good will to bring our boys home and negotiate a peace through the U.N.

MRS. R. GOLDHEIME.

GLENDALE, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: You were great on Today NBC program subject of the President's private war in southeast Asia. But many think the king can do wrong, another F.D.R. image and look where its got us?

You should have been a Republican—yes—we shoot at Communists over there and coddle them here at home. Speak at colleges, etc.

Yours truly,

H. BANKY.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with everything you said about our policy in Asia, on the "Today" show.

Glad to hear you express your opinion. We need more like you in the Government. Hope others who agree with you, will write you. As I am sure you will hear from the GOLDWATER followers, and Pentagon friends. Keep talking.

Very truly,

MRS. MILTON H. ROGERS.

OAK PARK, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We agree with you that President Johnson has no power to make or declare war in Vietnam but only Congress has.

We heard you on the "Today" program, June 25, 1964, and thank you for telling us the best way to settle the Vietnam situation is in the United Nations as I and most American people I am sure agree. We want peace and not men killed—that is what the United Nations is for.

MARY and SOL HAMMERSTEIN.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Thank you for expressing the truth on the "Today" program on TV channel 4, on June 25, 1964. It is indeed unconstitutional to have a President of United States make war or declare war instead of Congress. We do not want war and have American boys killed in Vietnam. We want things settled peacefully in the United Nations.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. ABE GOLDBERG.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: We listened to your brilliant speech on South Vietnam on "Today" TV. It is refreshing to have a Democrat pick flaws in the present administration's policy with concrete knowledge of our Constitution. We don't want another Korca, or Bay of Pigs mistake.

If we are at war let Congress declare it. Am proud that our 18-year-old son enlisted in World War II—as did his father in World War I—both after Congress declared war.

We try to help other countries, yet are blind to our own small civil war.

Respectfully,

H. BRICE.

15156

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was good to hear your strong voice in opposition to the Vietnam war. I have been disturbed over it from the beginning and feel powerless to do anything about it. I agree thoroughly with you.

Sincerely,

SARA LOWREY.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up your vehement protest against stepped-up, undeclared dirty war in Vietnam where American casualty list enlarges daily.

Show up the wickedness of a statement from some underling in authority in Washington that no protection assured to those brave young people helping to register in Mississippi, followed that day or next by total disappearance of three heroic young people. Place Army where needed.

Admiringly yours,

A. C. DAAT.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Confucius said the first step toward peace and order is "to rectify the names"—to call things for what they are—a spade a spade, a thief a thief, etc.

We are greatly encouraged by your boldness in calling a spade a spade and war-mongering war-mongering. For the future your country and the future of mankind, we hope you will continue to do it just as you are doing.

Our sincerest support for your effort.

Dr. and Mrs. HAROLD BASS.

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1964.

We are backing your stand to get out of Vietnam. Keep the good work up. Good luck and best wishes.

The DORSBY FAMILY.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My congratulations to you for the courage you have shown in speaking out on the situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

LORETTA SMITH.

JUNE 25.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I deeply appreciated your thought-provoking statements on TV this morning and am thoroughly in accord with them. Many women in Maryland will agree with you.

LAURA C. A. LA FOE.

TACOMA, WASH., June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Cheers for your statement re U.S. position as the world's No. 1 war-monger.

The recent statements made by the administration regarding increasing the war is quite frightening. I urge you to do all you can to influence more Senators to your position.

YVONNE BRAUNE.

TACOMA, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I congratulate you on the courage and good sense you have shown on the Vietnam situation.

I fear though that there will not be enough to take the stand you have taken.

You have never done, in my opinion, what was expedient but dared to do what you thought was right.

MARK H. ANDERSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my appreciation for your stand regarding the involvement of the United States in South Vietnam.

Respectfully,

I. MARTIN.

LUBBOCK, TEX.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heard you on the "Today" program this morning and we think you are 100 percent right and under God, why we the people are sitting idly by, I do not understand.

Please make a speech on TV and rally the people behind you. Another mistake Johnson made is appointing Earl Warren to head the committee on the President's death and now sending Dulles to Mississippi.

Mr. and Mrs. HENDRIX.

DEAR SENATOR: We fully agree with you in stating that the United States should stay out of Vietnam and to try and prevent war and leave the problem up to the United Nations. Our community are all for your statements.

THE 85 CLUB.

GLOVERSVILLE, N.Y., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress, Washington, D.C.

This morning I heard you on channel 6 about 8 a.m. Your voice was expressed truthfully against our policy in Asia. I think I should rush to tell you I support you 100 percent. I am going to send a card to the President and tell him I support you and hope he changes the policy to give the U.N. the case.

Sincerely,

S. R. NESTLE.

CLAREMONT, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I lived in Peiping 1916-40. I heard you on "Today." We sure agree with you 100 percent. Keep talking and good luck.

FLOAA WILSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your efforts to have United States find new approaches to southeast Asia problems—and I support you in your opposition to unilateral military power that short-circuits the United Nations or other international means for peaceful, creative solution to these problems.

Sincerely,

OLIVER HENDERSON, M.D.

STOCKTON, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Congratulations on your Vietnam speech.

What can we do to help you?

WILDA HUFFMAN,

California State Democratic Central
Committee, President, Democratic
Women's Club.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support and commend your position regarding our involvement in Vietnam. It is time more of us expressed our opinions on this vital issue. We feel sure that many other Americans think as you do.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. PAUL KERBER.

ALVIN, TEX.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for speaking for peace. I have wondered for a long time what my boys and others could do about peace and dying in Vietnam. It seems that we all want to know more good reasons for dying in Vietnam. The climate would kill a lot. Let's settle the problems without killing our boys.

Thanks,

Mrs. J. E. BURGE.

LAMONT, IOWA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your "Today" appearance was good. You presented our case well. I agree with all you said, sir. And I urge you to continue saying it with the same clarity and reason and restraint and hard-hitting truth and patriotism that you showed in your "Today" appearance.

Perhaps the policies in Asia are devices to last through election; but the danger is that they will get out of hand, or into the wrong hands—and we may not be able to stem the tide. Even, without that, to play politics with the lives of men seems very wrong. But it is probably no bluff—and we need your voice—and that of other good liberals or we may well lose the respect of the world.

Truly, and with great thanks,

GLADYS MARTIN.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Heard you this morning over the "Today" program. Very thankful we have a Senator like you. I am very much in agreement with your convictions. And the average U.S. citizen is also, I believe. The layman is discussing, and seriously, politics, these days and the present administration would be surprised at the amount of commonsense he has.

I am neither a Democrat or from Oregon, but heartily endorse your standpoint on this issue (Vietnam).

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. GRACE CLOER.

DEAR SIR: I'm glad to hear your views on Vietnam on TV. I agree with you. I've lived in Japan for 2 years, the news there presents only the views of the administration, yet I've only talked to one person who believed we ought to be in Vietnam. I would like to hear interviews of the common soldier, both for and against the war in Vietnam. I've heard them, but never see them in print.

Mrs. D. R. NICHOLS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard that you will oppose confirmation of General Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam. Thank God for a few like you.

I asked Senator HART to send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just so I can follow what you and your friends are saying about Laos and Vietnam. I told him why, too.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. MILDRED FRANKLIN.

DEAR SIR: You are the only one with any sense in Washington. I hope they put all the warmongers in the firing lines in Asia, as the rest of us people don't care who rules Asia. We have enough to take care of our own troubles, and so has all other people of the world no matter who rules them, and for God's sake we would like to know the truth from the State and Defense Departments for a change before we lose all the faith in our Government.

Appreciate your outspokenness on stopping the terrible war in Vietnam. No more American boys must be killed there.

Mrs. B. RAIND.

BURT, MICH.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good work. I wish you luck in stopping Maxwell Taylor from becoming Ambassador to that terrible jungle mudhole called South Vietnam. We Americans, including little Caroline and John John do not want a nuclear devastation war for our America over that Vietnam mudhole. It is insane.

E. J. SCHRAMM.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15157

JUNE 2, 1964.

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: Hearty approval from us and many of our friends for your stand against U.S. war in Vietnam (we have just heard your brilliant presentation on "Today" show). Somebody has got to stand for sanity—keep it up.

BEN and DAISYLEE FUSON.

LOUDONVILLE, N.Y.

SIR: On "Today," June 25, you spoke the truth. It had never appeared to us in that light. We trust you will continue to press and stress your convictions.

MRS. ROBERT S. HART.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your interview on the "Today" program and only wish, as a mother of two sons (volunteers, one Army, one Air Force) that we had more good men like you representing our Government and interests.

A MOTHER OF TWO SERVICEMEN.

Honorable MORSE: You are absolutely right about the Asian situation. I have been concerned about our policy there for a long time.

Please keep talking and attempt to get the people here to protest.

M. F. FRICHSER.

JUNE 24, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: When you speak out for us, for our sons, you revive our hopes, bolster our faith, help us believe that somehow, somehow simple sanity will prevent our Government from forcing our finest young men into a hell that would be even worse than Korea. Do those who would vote for a horror of this kind have no sons, no grandsons? Have they become bloodless, heartless, conscienceless? I say, let them go and face the misery, degradation, abuse, torture—that has been the lot of our boys who were sent to fight battles for people who would not fight for themselves. Yours may seem a lone voice, Senator MORSE, but the people are listening. Would to God those in power were before it's too late. We honor and respect you because you speak out for us—and say what we believe.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your opposition to our asinine policy on Vietnam. Your voice is like a bit of fresh air coming out of Washington these days.

Yours truly,

NORMAN JENSEN.

JUNE 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I am one of many citizens grateful that you are making every effort to preserve the good image of our country. I have been in the Far East and southeast Asia and know how "we" are hated. Your stand on the Vietnam situation has my wholehearted support.

HELEN BLAIR.

LOS ANGELES,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: Your stand on the situation in Vietnam is courageous and expresses the feeling of most of my friends and myself. Keep up your good work.

RUBY ROSENTHAL,

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems that the South Vietnam government are unpopular with its citizenry, and that our soldier advisers are getting themselves killed, apparently they are being killed in warfare instead of safely acting as advisors.

Respectfully,

ALLEN KENDEL.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: We heard your interview on the "Today" show this morning and thoroughly agree with everything you said. We have followed your career with a great deal of interest through the years and only regret that we are unable to vote for you. We wish to thank you for representing our views in the Senate.

EDNA and ARNOLD KLEIN,

BELLEVUE, ILL.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I listened to your interview on the "Today" show. I congratulate you for your "unpopular position" of disagreement with this administration's position on Vietnam. I also feel this matter should be in the United Nations hands. Please pursue this standpoint—many American agree, I am sure. You were very forceful on the interview.

TACOMA, WASH.,

June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: By some happy miracle the TV carried your toxin alarm. Please take this to the U.N. The Congress has plainly abdicated its power to declare war or peace.

PAUL BROWNE.

HOUSTON, TEX.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Many times I do not agree with your ideas. But I do want to give you a big pat on the back for your feelings and for your courageous statements as expressed when you appeared on Today's program this a.m. Too many acts have been by Executive action.

LOUIS B. ARMBRECHT,
A Legionnaire and a 40 et 8'er.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

I support your stand on our getting out of South Vietnam which would save the world from a dangerous war.

MRS. F. ELKINS.

CALDWELL, N.J.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to commend you for your speech on South Vietnam on "Today's Show" June 25. Keep fighting for public interest because it is the only way to bring attention to our representatives in Congress as to the dire needs of men dying in a disorganized war of the rice paddy in South Vietnam. You have the heart of the American Eagle.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. MOONEY, Jr.
JAMES PHILLIPS.

TOPANGA, CALIF.,

June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position regarding southeast Asia. Keep up good work.

IAN and JANE THIERMANN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to your brilliantly spoken on issues and answers.

MORRIS BERKOWITZ.

DETROIT, MICH.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo your stand on Vietnam et al. Many are behind you—keep pressure on.

ROSE and MILTON SCHWARTZ.

EDINBURG, TEX.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your statement on TV "Today Show" Wednesday was most courageous and genuinely American. We need more national integrity and less gun-boat diplomacy in our foreign policy. Congratulations.

ANDREW OSTRUM.

LOMITA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard you on "Meet the Press." And I was so happy when I heard you being opposed to our fighting in Vietnam.

All my life I've been a Democrat. But why must our party always get into a war? (Ike stopped Korea.) But here we're in another.

Yours sincerely,

E. O. ROGETAD.

PASADENA, CALIF., June 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am heartily in accord with your condemnation of the present policy of the U.S.A. in South Vietnam.

I have used your suggestions which appeared in our daily newspaper in a letter to our President.

I am hopeful that the State Department will change its policy before more blood is spilled for our own selfish purposes.

Very truly yours,

MISS GRACE M. LEALTAD.

MORRISON HOTEL, CHICAGO.

Mr. MORSE: Congratulations on your views as distributed into the public domain on "Issues and Answers."

You are right. The United States of America has too long violated the Geneva Charter. Red China can be "mellowed." But not if we continue to be an aggressor in southeast Asia.

TONY LAVELLI.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,

June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter, which appeared in the Ann Arbor News of June 26, should be of interest to you. We have reason to believe that a number of Ann Arbor women share our uneasiness about the course our country seems to be taking in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH CONVERSE.

HEADED FOR WAR IN ASIA?

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

Last Tuesday President Johnson said, "War is obsolete because there can be no winner." On the same day, Senator MORSE warned, "The United States is headed for war in Asia and will be hated for the next 500 years by the majority of mankind."

Reading the news these past weeks has given us the uneasy feeling that we, along with the rest of the American public, were being carefully prepared for a new U.S. policy in southeast Asia. The "new look" has been unfolded in a steady flow of announcements: redeployment of service personnel to more strategic bases; new military shipments (oh, just routine replacements of worn-out equipment); then the sudden emergency—full-blown—of a jet air base just south of the 17th parallel in South Vietnam; and now the appointment of a military authority on guerrilla fighting as our Ambassador in Saigon, when a civilian with U.N. experience withdrew. We gather that the administration expected us and many others to be hard to sell on the new policy unless we were gradually conditioned for it.

Well, this time we are going to stay hard to sell. We are told that we must honor our commitment in southeast Asia, even though as knowledgeable a person as Walter Lipp-

15158

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

mann has called the commitment a blunder. Now the United States is "honoring" this commitment (1) by increasing it and (2) by violating other commitments. Our country is publicly committed to leadership in the world's quest for peaceful solutions of complex problems. Our new southeast Asia policy violates this high commitment. Our new jet base in South Vietnam clearly violates the Geneva agreement of 1954.

It's easier to build a military base in a foreign country than to withdraw it once it's there. Khrushchev withdrew his missiles from Cuba but we still have Guantanamo and have sworn to hold on to it. Now it seems we've established a little bit of "American" territory in South Vietnam and will be asked to defend it to the death. Ah, whose death? Who and how many will die for that aircraft base in Vietnam, built with our tax dollars and without our knowledge?

We appear to be proceeding in disregard of the honest reservations of our allies and of Senator Morse's "majority of mankind" to come. In so doing, do we exhibit an unseemly arrogance which closes doors we can ill afford to close in a world where "war is obsolete?"

GAIL W. KELLUM.
ELIZABETH CONVERSE.

KENNESBUNK, MAINE,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your conviction, expressed on the NBC "Today" program this morning, that the whole question of Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia should be taken to the United Nations for decision meets with my hearty approval.

I, as only one individual, and a woman at that, have long felt that we were conducting a war illegally without the voted approval of Congress.

We cannot talk of peace out of one side of our mouths, and conduct an illegal war with justification, out of the other side.

Like many others (I presume), I feel frustrated, listening and reading day after day about all these many problems that face humans all over the world, and not being able to do anything about them.

If there is any way that I can support you in your efforts to have the U.S. Government take this southeast Asia problem to the U.N. for action, instead of the United States of America drifting into a unilateral war with Communist China, I'd be glad to do my bit.

Sincerely,

MARION E. COLE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After hearing your views expressed on the program "Issues and Answers" today, I must agree with your proposal to let the U.N. solve the Vietnam crisis.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA M. CONDON.

LYNCHBURG, VA.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you last night on "Issues and Answers." I had wondered why we were not working through United Nations in Vietnam. Why aren't we? I agree with you we should, and I hope we do.

Sincerely,

Miss ELSIE W. GILLIAM.

MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Today I wrote to President Johnson and Dean Rusk taking issue with them with the

present U.S. policy in Vietnam and Laos. I have little understanding of our unilateral policy of force there for issues which seem political and not military ones. I too, counsel the President to use his policy of settling problems with words of reason rather than actions of force and destruction.

Frankly, I am filled with fear that this little dirty war will be escalated to a big dirty war. I hope you will continue to speak out loud and often as you see this issue.

If there is anything further you feel I can do, I shall be most happy to give it consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MANUEL SIEGEL.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: For several weeks I have been following your statements on Vietnam, and the President's handling of the war there, with great surprise.

I really didn't think any Member of the Senate had the political courage that you show. But in the long run I think you may find that the majority of the American people would support your view over the administration view on Vietnam if presented the issues and allowed to choose.

Certainly I agree with you completely and urge you to keep on. You set an example for other Members of the Senate and, I hope, may keep us from some hideous consequence. Best wishes.

GEORGE SPENCER.

CHICAGO,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I watched the interview you gave this afternoon over ABC and I was gratified to see that there are still responsible people that are sane.

I am a foreign student from Greece. I am a bit at ease because I know that "your man from Washington" will have a landslide. I would be more than honored if I had the chance to shake your hand. I am certain that if you will happen to visit Chicago, I will not miss the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN PAVLIDIS.

LINDSBURG, KANS.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your splendid television interview yesterday. Your presentation was lucid and convincing. Keep plugging.

Mrs. CHARLES P. GREENOUGH.

TENAHIA, TEX.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We just saw and heard you on the "Today" program, and we just must write and tell you how very much we agree with you. I do hope you continue to tell the people what it will mean if we do get into a war. I wish everyone in the United States could hear you.

Congratulations again and please keep it up.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. MARION STONE.

BETHESDA, MD.,
June 29, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: In your address in Minneapolis you renewed the pledge to protect the freedom of South Vietnam and to use the force necessary to that end. However, the applause of listeners was reserved for your pledge to continue your quest for peace.

We do not believe that our foreign policy should be determined by a popularity poll but it is evident that there is no enthusiasm for escalating the civil war in South Vietnam into an international conflict. We agree with your remarks praising the United Nations and so we ask, "Why that organization has not been used in the present conflict?" Is the present government any more than the Diem regime one of the peoples' own choice?

We are not experts but it seems to make good sense to us to ask for a plebiscite of South and North Vietnam under U.N. auspices and with all foreign troops, including our own, withdrawn. If we cannot win, we might achieve neutrality at least.

This course should remove the implication that under the guise of "protection" we are helping to impose an unwelcome government on the people of South Vietnam and taking sides in a civil war. It should further your quest for peace, and still retain our honor.

Sincerely yours,

L. D. and ALICE MACINTYRE.

HYATTSVILLE, MD.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After listening to "Issues and Answers" I had to write to you to say that I am completely in accord with your views on the war in Vietnam. I have been increasingly more disturbed about our policies in southeast Asia. I feel that we do have a responsibility to the world to advance democracy and freedom. However, I also feel we have no right to make war. When we adopt Communist tactics we have already lost because our goal is for people to choose freely. Freedom cannot and should not be advanced by U.S. force.

Cuba is a glaring example of our setting up a dictator in the name of democracy and how it has ended is not what our leaders foresaw.

Please keep up your plea to keep us fighting for peace and for a strong United Nations.

Sincerely,

BONNIE L. WALKER,
Democrat From Maryland.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senior Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to join those who heartily endorse your stand on our Government's attitude toward the situation in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON S. CLOUD, D.D.S.

JUNE 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please send me your speeches and whatever else you can on Vietnam. I have been guardedly speaking to friends and writing my representatives urging a review of our policy there. You might say that I have lacked the courage to come right out and condemn the role our Government is playing. I appreciate all the more your forthrightness.

Now I am really ready to speak out, and keep speaking out. I don't care what my neighbors may think. One stands the chance of being called a traitor, and all the rest, but it now seems abundantly clear to me that my country's best interests, and our national honor, depend upon us coming to our senses. To continue as we have is to morally disgrace ourselves.

But I do need all the facts I can get. It is difficult to piece the news together—the omissions are so gross, however, that the

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15159

phrase "news management" seems wholly justified. Your speeches are weakly reported even in the New York Times. So please send me what you can even though I am not your constituent.

Most sincerely,

NEW YORK, N.Y.

EDWARD CRAWFORD.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just listened to you speak on Vietnam on the "Today" show, and you gave me heart. You said many things that badly need saying. Please continue your fight. What you are saying is vastly important, but just as important is that someone is saying it. We in this country, I maintain, are not inherently aggressive and impractical, but we are unbelievably ignorant, especially where our relationship to and standing in the world are concerned. Thank you for the forthright expression of views—and facts—which will perhaps reduce this ignorance.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE D. DAVIS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I greatly admire the courage you have shown in your outspoken attitude toward the bloody mess in South Vietnam. I think that your position, more than that of any other prominent American, will be vindicated when all the facts are known.

As a young man of draft age it would provoke a crisis of conscience if I were conscripted to fight in a war so senselessly brutal and self-defeating.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. BATEMAN, JR.

P.S.—I would appreciate receiving a printed copy of each of your speeches on the Vietnam problem.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S &
WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 14,
Eureka, Calif., May 26, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Our membership at their regular meeting of May 20, 1964, voted to commend you and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, for your courageous injection of truth and reason into the foreign policy debate. We feel we are being sucked into a full-scale war in South Vietnam without all the facts being told the people. We would like to know what the State Department calls a "constitutional government" when in South Vietnam our soldiers are dying to protect what they call a constitutional government, while in Brazil an elected constitutional government was overthrown and these same people fell all over themselves to congratulate the "brass" there for their success in the overthrowing of the government there.

Would you kindly send us a copy of your speeches on South Vietnam and on foreign policy?

Sincerely yours,

O. L. DEARINGER,
N.C.D.C. Representative,
I.L.W.U. Local 14.

LA HABRA, CALIF.,
June 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The brief news reports I hear of your speeches the past few months concerning Vietnam are very interesting and timely. You seem to be the only one talk-

ing any sense on this critical issue in public, although I think there is a lot of public sympathy for making a realistic settlement in southeast Asia.

I would very much appreciate receiving copies of previous or future speeches by you on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. HOLSER.

JUNE 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sorry there are not more politicians to speak with your realism and courage. I would feel we had a much safer world and better future for our country and its people.

Is it possible to send me a copy of the speech you made in the Senate, Thursday, June 4, with reference to the southeast Asian situation? What can those of us who feel you speak for us, do?

Thank you.

Mrs. ROBERT SHERMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read some of your recent speeches in the Senate on our foreign policy and must express my hearty agreement. Your forthright stand is courageous beyond words and must eventually influence others to look at the world more objectively.

Sincerely yours,

EARL BUDIN, M.D.

UNIONTOWN, OHIO,
June 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you to tell you that I am wholeheartedly in agreement with your views on our involvement in southeast Asia. Though I am a college instructor and a scientist, I have have an active interest in politics and world affairs. I believe that the United States should get off the southeast Asia mainland altogether—including both Laos and South Vietnam. The State Department should realize that the United States cannot win a war on the mainland of Asia. Is this President Johnson's idea of prosperity—an artificially created prosperity based on building war materials for a war in Asia? If the President doesn't soon get us disentangled from that mess, he will not get my vote in November, even though I agree with his domestic policies otherwise.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

CONRAD GUTERMUTH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Anyone who has had the experience of standing in the lonely trenches of fighting for what conscience dictates can only commend you and Senator GRUENING for the splendor of your courage.

Anyone who has read the whole spectrum of thought involved in this southeast Asia problem can only come out in one place—in your corner.

WILMINGTON, DEL., June 19, 1964.

MARIE HITCHEN.

JUNE 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your heroic stand you have taken in the Senate, especially in regard to stopping the war in Vietnam. I do hope more and more Congressmen will follow your humane and democratic ideas.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. BETSY DAVENPORT.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to give you my sincere congratulations for your stands in the Senate against the war in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work. Turns are certainly needed in most phases of our foreign policy.

Senator FULBRIGHT and yourself have certainly been the mainstays for any attempt to overhaul this country's stands.

Sincerely,

MEYER FASMAN.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.,

June 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Please vote to cut the foreign aid bill deeply. Let the people vote on it and we would do away with it entirely. No reason in the world why we should support the rest of the world. Thank you.

W. W. KELLY.

P.S.—It has not made us any friends and note the "go home Yank" after taking our money.

JUNE 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again, let me tell you how very much I appreciate your efforts to disengage our military in southeast Asia. I am enclosing our local and current effort to help you (and our "Nation under God").

With sincere encouragement.

LOIS D. WARREN.

This enclosure is going to each member of Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Washington Post, March 29, 1964: "Two recent South Vietnamese napalm bombings, which fell into the brutal category, have grievously hurt the U.S. image throughout the world. One was widely dramatized by the publication of an Associated Press photograph on March 20 which showed a child in his father's arm, badly burned by air-launched, jellied, gasoline bombs which had fired a Vietnamese village * * * Publication of the AP photo resulted in the (U.S.) Defense Department's acknowledging for the first time that napalm has been furnished South Vietnam—under the military aid program, and that it has been dropped by Vietnamese planes provided by U.S. assistance plan."

DO YOU APPROVE?

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, March 25, 1964: "We should never have gone in there. We should not have stayed in. We should get out now."

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska: "The time has come to reverse our policy of understanding to defend areas such as South Vietnam * * * A return of troops to our own shores should begin."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana: "There has not been and there does not exist today a basis in our national interest which would justify the assumption of primary American responsibility in this situation which might well involve the sacrifice of a vast number of American lives * * *"

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, March 30, 1964: "By what right did the Secretary of Defense go over to South Vietnam and pledge U.S. support for a 'thousand years, if necessary,' in behalf of the American people. He had no such right. The American people should answer him in no uncertain terms."

Whittier Peace Council recommends immediate withdrawal of all American forces from southeast Asia and urges settlement of the war by the 14-nation Geneva Conference of 1962 under the auspices of the United Nations.

Write President Johnson, Senator KUCHEL, Senator ENGLE today.

This message is brought to you by the Whittier Peace Council and the following groups: Whittier Chapter American Association for the United Nations, Peace and Service Committee—First Friends Church, Whittier Monthly Meeting of Friends, Whittier Friends Unprogramed Meeting, Whittier

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

15160

Area Women Strike for Peace, Whittier La Mirada Unitarian Fellowship.

For further information—or to help defray cost of this ad—please send requests and contributions to: Whittier Peace Council, 821 East Sunrise Drive, Whittier, Calif.

TAKOMA PARK, MD.,
June 20, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: We are gravely concerned with the situation in Vietnam. There is considerable feeling that we had no right to intervene in the first place, and our apparent plans to escalate the fighting there could develop into a war with China. Several Senators, such as Senator WAYNE MORSE, have made serious suggestions for negotiating a peace in Vietnam and withdrawing our troops. We urgently ask you to consider their proposals, stop the fighting, and begin negotiating immediately before it is too late.

Sincerely,
Dr. and Mrs. REX V. NAYLOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I'm with you in your campaign to get U.S. troops recalled from Vietnam. This is a senseless war, in which we have no business.

Thanks for speaking out.

Sincerely yours,
(Miss) ELIZABETH YATES.

JUNE 20, 1964.

KENDALL, FLA.,
June 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I view as most distressing the "feelers" appearing throughout our news media citing the need for stepped-up military action in southeast Asia. If, as I believe, these are designed to test public response to such an eventuality, I feel I would be derelict in my duty as a citizen if I failed to express my strong opposition to it. It is my firm opinion that we have no moral or legal right to inflict our will on the people of southeast Asia, and that if action of any kind is indicated, we should not take it unilaterally upon ourselves, but should bring the matter before the United Nations for solution.

Respectfully submitted.

REYNOLDS MOODY,
Lieutenant Colonel U.S. Marine Corps,
Retired.

ROCHESTER, MICH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am hoping for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam "mess." The U.N., the Geneva Conference, any alternative to escalating the war or even continuing it.

Let us spend that million and a half a day on assuring every one the right to vote in this country or lessening poverty here.

Sincerely,

MARGARET DUFFIELD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 26, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your very excellent speech on "Meet the Press." May 24, 1964.

What a pity that the public do not know the facts about such matters and must depend on the muddled reports that our newspapers print.

The Christian Science Monitor, New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal seem to do better reporting than most others.

Please appear on the TV as often as possible to give us, the public, the facts.

Senator MORSE, my thinking is that before peace of any kind can be attained it is necessary to bring China into the United Nations. My understanding of the United Nations is that it imposes an obligation on member governments to observe the provisions of the charter and the resolutions of the membership, and the important opportunity of behind-the-scenes discussions.

We need more speeches like yours and more men who are not afraid to speak the truth about facts as they exist.

Sincerely yours,

ERMA RAPP.

P.S.—I too felt very badly about the speech of Ambassador A. Stevenson. Twice I have heard him give speeches that I felt were from his lips and not his heart; they made me very sad.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A few hours ago I sat down in a barbershop and casually thumbed through a recent issue of Life magazine which contained excellent photographs of the Vietnamese war. With my heart pounding I saw our side torturing young men in the Vietcong to extract confessions. The full horror of what we are doing suddenly dawned upon me.

Should the Asiatic multitudes achieve a dominant position in the world of tomorrow it will be a very difficult thing to be an American. All Americans will be held accountable for these crimes. We cannot plead ignorance when Life magazine so clearly has presented all of us with the facts as they are. Our Government has illegally committed American troops to a foreign war. Congress was not consulted nor was the U.N.

Please Senator MORSE, keep plugging for a cessation of our foul, filthy war in southeast Asia.

There are so few men who can do the honest, courageous thing that you have done. May you have the strength to continue.

Sincerely,
HAROLD SCHNEIER.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, S.C., June 16, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I completely agree with your position on Vietnam. Our troop involvement there violates every precept of international law, just as it violates every precept of the existential morality of Christ.

As a Democrat, I am especially heartened by your willingness to criticize a Democratic administration. We need desperately in this country some opposition to the bipartisan warmongering which has kept the cold war going and stifled a realistic peace program. On the issue of Vietnam you are supplying it, with matchless eloquence and logic.

Sincerely,

EMMETT J. DURANT.

MESA, ARIZ.,
June 20, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We hear with grave concern from Mr. Brinkley on the news what the State Department intends to do in Vietnam—send 200,000 of our boys in there to get killed and start a war with China that would never end. You could tell by the looks on Mr. Brinkley's face that he is worried, and I and all the people I've talked to are worried.

Just why does our State Department think they have the power to declare war? Is that not still the power of Congress? Of all the people I've talked to, I can't find one who

knows of any reason why we are messing around down there in the first place.

Mr. Bundy, of our State Department, states we are going in there and extend the war to the north. MacArthur tried that in Korea thinking the Chinks would do nothing. We got run out of there by the hordes of Chinese and lost a lot of boys.

We are wondering how many sons Mr. Bundy has of military age. I think Mr. Bundy had better go up to the Bay of Fundy and get lost.

Mr. Brinkley gave us one ray of hope when he said you were going to demand the withdrawal of our troops, as they were in Vietnam illegally, and cut out all aid to that country. Those people in Vietnam are so busy fighting each other that they don't have time to worry about the Commies.

A. J. MCGINN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You seem to be one of the few humanitarians in Congress. That's the reason we are writing to you. If we lived in Oregon our family of six voters would support you in full. The only request that we have to make is read June 12 issue, 1964, and see the pictures under the caption "But this is my duty," in Life magazine.

Please tell Congress that at least in this area our people are sick and tired of this senseless war.

Are we a nation of barbarians?

Thank you, Senator and the best of luck.
Very sincerely,

LESTER W. DENEVAN.
WILDA A. DENEVAN.
LESTER M. DENEVAN.
TERRY L. DENEVAN.

LONGVIEW, WASH.,
June 19, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a line to you to encourage you in your attacks on foreign aid to corrupt, unreforming governments and on our policy in Vietnam.

I realize, as I'm sure you do, that such independent statements can be dangerous to you politically; it takes a strong and courageous personality to point out the harsh facts to the administration and the American public as you have been doing so effectively in recent months.

Best of luck to you, and I hope to keep hearing your strong, liberal voice on the major issues confronting the United States today and in the future.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM J. GABOURY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Your work for peace is greatly appreciated.

War cannot bring victory, will not destroy communism, can only destroy people, property to the American image. Would like to have your material on the questions of peace. Thank you in advance.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. VERA BACHMAN.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree wholeheartedly with your views regarding our "out-law" activities in southeast Asia and particularly in Vietnam. I began to rethink our participation in these countries this past week when you expressed yourself following one committee meeting with the Secretary of Defense and General Taylor.

1964

I truly believe that a U.N. functioning "peace force" should be the position being expounded by our Government and not the unilateral military force as is presently being employed.

I support your view and will make known my acceptance of them to my own representatives.

Yours truly,

HOWARD RATCLIFFE.
 MARTINSBURG, W. Va.

CARMEL, CALIF.,
 June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your remarks on Vietnam on the NBC "Today" program. I have spent considerable time in that area in the U.S. Navy and feel closer to the situation than the average citizen.

Let me thank you for enlightening the public with your knowledgeable comments. I agree with you and hope you are successful in blocking our military entry into war in Asia.

Sincerely yours,

HUNTER W. STEWART.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I saw and heard you on the "Today Show", and I believe you are 100 percent right. I have always admired you, you have more brains in your little toe, than those generals who sit safely in Washington. While the kids go and get killed, to satisfy who? The generals of course.

The United Nations was born to settle wars, I am for President Johnson too, but he is letting the wrong people advise him.

I hope you convince these tinheads to change their minds.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. DAVIS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please, Senator MORSE, use whatever persuasion you can to stop the tide of aggressors in public office before we have another major war.

We in Florida cannot turn to our own Representatives; they are not fair to our own citizens, how can they be otherwise toward other nations.

Why is it so many people feel that they are entitled to tell other countries how to run their affairs when our own is about the most immoral in every way. Would any people be anxious to join our ways unless paid or coerced?

For a short time we had hopes in Governor Scranton till he came to Florida with the usual belligerent talk against Cuba.

I can look till I'm cross eyed but see only that they should settle their affairs inside Cuba by their own people. Will he spread communism to our neighboring countries? I think we are doing a better job of it by our example, by what is happening here in America and what we are doing to others.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. STOWE.
 MIAMI, FLA.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
 June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that I am correctly informed that you question present U.S. policies in Vietnam and favor our making an earnest effort to negotiate a settlement.

To me it seems urgent that negotiations begin promptly before the fighting is extended and that they include all the nations involved in southeast Asia. Enclosed is a

copy of a letter similar to one I have just sent to President Johnson.

Will you please exert every effort to extricate us and the world from a struggle which has the effect of preventing completion of a revolution and which may readily get out of control?

Sincerely yours,

GELSTON MCNEIL.

P.S.—This letter should have been modified for you. I do thank you, Senator MORSE, for your courageous and outspoken efforts in behalf of a more sane policy.

For months I've been intending to thank you for a fine presentation of constructive ideas with regard to Cuba which I heard in an interview-type program on station WGMS. Keep up the good work.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
 June 24, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
 The White House,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: "The people of the world, I think, prefer reasoned agreement to ready attack." Does not this statement of yours March 23, 1964) call for a sharp change in our course in southeast Asia? For not only is it true that people prefer reason to violence: it is also true that negotiation on the basis of equality holds the only hope for life in a nuclear age.

Since 1945 war in South Vietnam has been killing and starving and maiming with terrible suffering thousands of women and children as well as guerrilla fighters (who are also human). None seems to know or care just how many. At a meeting last week I heard a Government spokesman, while rightly lamenting the over 1,000 American casualties, speak with gusto of "wiping out the guerrillas."

We should be demonstrating that we are friends of the world's poor by aiding their "revolution of rising expectations" in Vietnam and everywhere. There can be no stability until this revolution is accomplished.

Instead, by supporting military juntas and other corrupt, oppressive governments, by supplying napalm and helicopters and barbed wire and cropdestroyers and other accoutrements of modern war, we are opposing the revolution. Whether or not we intend to do so makes little difference. We appear to the oppressed, underdeveloped, war-sick people to be just another white, colonial power replacing the French who, we ourselves admit, were denying the people their sacred right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I agree with Walter Lippmann (New York Tribune, May 28) and with Senator MORSE that American troops never should have gone into Vietnam. These men point out that we must correct our error by substituting negotiation for force. In these Senators CHURCH, GRUENING, BEALL, and others agree—as do I.

Stopping up the war in Vietnam would not only increase and prolong sufferings of the Vietnamese people and delay the revolution, it would drive Ho Chi Minh completely into the arms of China (even as our starvation policies toward Cuba have driven Castro into dependence upon the great Communist powers). Extending the war will also cause U.S.S.R. to support China and thus destroy what improvement in relationships has been painstakingly and precariously worked out between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. Johnson, instead of aggravating animosity between China and the United States of America, is it not time that we develop toward that great country a creative approach which offers some possibility of peaceful solution of problems and resumption of our traditional friendship? Would it not be wise to consider President de Gaulle's

proposals? On the other hand, continuing our arrogant and self-righteous policies toward China tends to lose us friends, to solidify our enemies and thereby to lessen the possibility of rapprochement.

A year ago at American University President Kennedy pointed to the truth that conditions and attitudes in all kinds of societies change and that we must recognize and encourage changes in others and be open to change ourselves. It is also imperative, though extremely difficult for a nation—as for an individual—to admit its mistakes and change its course. Failure to do so will leave our country behind the march of history at best, and, at worst, can make our beloved country an instrument for the destruction of civilization.

Yours sincerely,

GELSTON MCNEIL.

METROPOLIS, ILL.,
 June 25, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks to you, for the words spoken over TV, when you said that our boys should not be dying in South Vietnam. I think it so shameful for the United States to have our boys there, when there has been no war declared. Why don't our so-called allies go in there too. They know its wrong. Here we have Cuba, right at our door, and no attention is given to what goes on there. But they risk their necks million miles away.

We cannot police the entire world. What would we say, when other countries sent military force over here to change our method?

I am for a peaceful country. The same should be followed with integration. We can't do anything by force. But people will understand each other as time goes on. We have no trouble here with a racial problem. All get along together and that goodwill, will spread if they would keep agitators out.

Thanks again to you. Will you appear on TV more often?

We need a House full of Members like you in Washington.

Yours very sincerely,

Mrs. RAYMOND MITCHELL.

P.S.—The feed grain program should be scrapped. It does more harm than good. The voluntary soil bank did so much more and cost less when people take their entire farm out of production. This feed grain the big farmers take out the less fertile ground and draw Government pay and use that money to buy fertilizer and livestock to produce more on remaining acres, and therefore the surplus gets greater.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
 June 29, 1964.

YOUR HONOR SENATOR MORSE: Just listened to you on the "Today" show. I think you are so right. Did we not learn anything from Korea.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. EDNA J. DALY.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
 June 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: At last we have someone on Capitol Hill who has given me and many of my neighbors the inside on this Vietnam subject. This a.m. on program "Today," I stopped my breakfast to sit and listen to you; so clear was your explaining this dogfight we are in, and cannot do one thing except pour our men and dollars to destruction.

I am a widow but our country is, as you just about put it; carrying the load that is not ours alone. Do keep up your clear, precise speaking; you will get others to see also. I do thank you for your brief talk.

I am,

Mrs. CLAIRE V. HESERLE.

15162

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

COFFEYVILLE, KANS., June 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senator of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard your talk on "Today" TV today concerning the action of the United States, directed by President Johnson, in southeast Asia.

I agree in detail with all you said in your TV interview.

Too much of our actions are based on wishful thinking and self-deception—based mostly on an infantile messianic complex that we have that we are the chosen people to lead the rest of the world into the land of milk and honey—while we are disintegrating here at home. We cannot understand that the rest of the world and no part of it see us as we see ourselves looking through our Alice in Wonderland lookingglass of wishful thinking, self-deception, and messianic complex.

Sincerely,

A. A. BAKER.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been watching this Asiatic situation and try and take a fair approach to our position there and what we should do about it. I have come to the definite conclusion that you have the right answer. We do not want to get mixed up in a hot war with China, and it looks right now as though we are headed in that direction. The French fought in that area for over 7 years with top-flight troops, coupled with material aid from us, and they were decisively beaten. Are we about to travel the same road? Such a stupid course would deplete our resources and manpower almost to a point of no return. It will be another Korea. It seems that the Democratic Party (I am independent) is as frequently labeled, "the war party."

Your position is, and will receive the support of the right thinking citizen. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

CLAYTON E. DIGG.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., June 24, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You have been a hundred percent right since you have been in the U.S. Senate.

As you say that the United States is sticking its nose in too far in other countries business. That nose might be punched and bled for several years at the expense of all Americans.

Mr. MORSE, you will have my vote and I know many more will vote for you.

I remain a true Democrat.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK H. SPICER.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Please say what you said on "Today" about Asia—loud and long until it is heard. Thank you, sir.

Respectfully,

HELEN SHIVE

Mrs. John J. Shive.

FLUSHING, MICH.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your hard-hitting remarks that we heard on the "Today" show this morning concerning the situation in southeast Asia certainly made a lot of commonsense. What a deep insight you have into this serious problem.

You have my husband's and my complete concurrence in the matter and there must be multitudes of people all over the country who feel the same.

It is to be fervently hoped that there is a possibility that you and others of your colleagues on Capitol Hill who share your views, might do something about all this be-

fore it is too late. Your straightforward talk on television this morning was certainly a step in the right direction.

Most respectfully yours,

Mrs. THEODORE BUELL.

LORAIN, OHIO,

June 25, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to state that I agree with your position on the dangerous situation in Vietnam and in southeast Asia in general.

I respectfully ask you that you do all in your power to prevent any war in southeast Asia involving the United States.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES J. BROWNE.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA,

June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for being willing to speak out concerning Vietnam. It is sad that our country should be the one to bypass the U.N. and not give it a chance at the peacemaking efforts for which it was instituted.

Further, I feel that the news media has allowed false ideas to guide public opinion because it is not pleasant to criticize. Where are our courageous news reporters? Thank you again.

Most sincerely,

ZENA GRUBB

Mrs. Charles E. Grubb.

WARSAW, IND.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to add my voice of approval to your stand on current Government issues.

Thank you for your courageous and truthful comments on the TV program of "Today," as well as those made previously.

I am among those who feel that our only hope for avoiding a national disaster is by following policies such as you have expressed, and I urge you to continue with increasing vigor.

Yours sincerely,

L. G. BAILEY.

SANDUSKY, OHIO,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of the State of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Heard you being interviewed on the "Today" show this morning, and was very interested in what you had to say, as I and my husband and sons have been thinking the same thoughts. Thank God for men like yourself who are not afraid to speak out, for your honesty, your forthrightness, and also your clarity. What in the name of heaven is happening to this country of ours, and who do you think President Johnson thinks he is, God? Do you understand how small and helpless a person like myself feels in the face of what is going on in Washington. I don't want my two clean young boys fighting in that stinking hole for a ridiculous cause—besides, according to those brainy intellectuals in government now, it isn't the fashion to "win" a war anymore. If we had permitted General MacArthur to go on in Korea, this war may not have been necessary. I am one of those Americans who believe everything he wrote. And, according to many of my friends, they believe also, only most of them are too apathetic to write.

I compliment you on your honest criticism of President Johnson. All this makes me

more of a fervent Goldwater admirer than ever. He is being criticized for his complaints about the United Nations. He is being honest, too.

Thank you again.

Mrs. GERALD LUTZ.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Bravo for you on the "Today" show this morning. I hope you get much backing for your stand on Vietnam. We need more men of your caliber who will speak out for the good of this country.

Faithfully yours,

MYRTLE G. OSTERGREN
(Mrs. Herbert L.).

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I am in full agreement with your views on the situation in southeast Asia.

If it will help to show President Johnson that we want your ideas of carrying this problem to the U.N., I hope this letter will be used in that behalf.

I only hope it is not too late to save us from getting into another holocaust.

May God bless you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOR MEAGHER.

LIMA, OHIO, June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Member of the U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am not one to write letters but after reading the attached editorial I got so mad about some of the thinking of the powers in Washington that you wonder. It looks to me that they are trying to do everything possible to get in a fight with China. Then we will have another Korea on our hands, only a great many times worse.

My reason for writing you is to let you know I like your stand on this matter and many more.

Thanks for your time in reading this note.

Respectfully,

RAY W. BARNETT,
Treasurer, Allen County.

ST. JOHN CHURCH,

Greensburg, Ind., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your viewpoint of the South Vietnam war.

I agree with you 100 percent.

What can we do to further your program? Sincerely,

Rev. A. J. SCHNEIDER.

WISCASSET, MAINE,

June 28, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: No one could deny the tremendous influence exerted on the foreign policy of the United States by the Pentagon. Just why a military department of our Government should be adjudged to be in possession of infallible wisdom in the area of peaceful international relations is beyond my understanding. With specific reference to this Nation's unilateral action in southeast Asia—which bids fair to represent the worst bungling by this country in international relationships for all time—I consider it to be absolutely shameful, utterly appalling, and entirely inconsistent with the policies of a nation presumably working toward world peace. Apart from our participation in the matter as a part of a duly appointed United Nations force sent to restore peace, the United States has no military business in the area.

Speaking as a private citizen, I most heartily commend you in your stand on the issue. Let us put the problem before the United Nations for its judgment and action. This is where it belongs, and is the only place it belongs. Our saying one thing and doing another will yet be the death of us. If peace be the aim of this Nation, then in the name of God let us be about it.

Yours truly,

SCOTT D. KITTREDGE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I congratulate you being a true American, being elected and holding a political office in our Government, upholding and not ignoring the Constitution of the United States, that reads, there shall be no foreign entanglements. As other politicians seem to ignore though sworn into office over a Bible.

Referring to your very true conversational talk over NBC-TV program, this is "Today."

It is a pleasure to you talk as a true American, who knows what you are talking about, a type of an American like President George Washington. And thinking deeper perhaps if the United States had stayed out of World War II, there would not be communism.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. J. ZINSMEISTER.

STUART, FLA., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me congratulate you on your fearless opinion expressed on the "Today" show, as I have the same idea about our boys in Vietnam. Please do everything to stop this unconstitutional war. I agree with you that this is a McNamara war and that we should not send a military man as our Ambassador into that area (Taylor).

Having had four brothers in the First World War, while I was trained as a nurse, and then three nephews in the Second World War on the German side, and three nephews here on the American side, I know what families are sacrificing. I lived in Germany during the first war and as an American citizen here in the second war, doing nursing and social work.

While I do a lot of traveling in different countries now, I know how we are almost despised for meddling in everybody's business. We should let other countries decide for themselves what they want to be, but guard our own country, according to our Constitution.

More power to men like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS DARLING.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have been in sympathy with your thinking on the problem in Vietnam right along, but your pronouncements this morning on the "Today" program makes me want to shout it from the rooftops that the United States should get out of southeast Asia and "rejoin" the United Nations. It seems to me that of all nations we should not desecrate the sanctuary of peace. Keep up your good work, Mr. MORSE. Your voice may be the keystone to the arch.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEORA D. SURRYHNE.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A breath of fresh air this morning when I heard your fine comment on television. I personally think you're

one of the smartest or most intelligent men in Washington, D.C. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

W. E. HALL, Jr.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I salute you on your courageous stand on American involvement in southeast Asia. We cannot correct the mistakes of 19th century Imperialism by sacrificing American lives. Nor can we hope to persuade the Asians—in the throes of a colonial revolution captured by the Communists—that we are any different from their former white masters and that our brand of freedom will be any better than what they have hitherto known at the hands of the whites; that is to say, exploitation and humiliation.

I wholeheartedly support your position that our only recourse is the United Nations. Only if we direct our efforts through the United Nations can we avoid the onus of being considered the aggressor out there by the Asians and the other noncommitted peoples of the world. To do otherwise is to go it alone, setting our course on disaster. America has long been in need of such straight-from-the-shoulder advice as you gave this day on the "Today" show. God-speed.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE TEHAN FISCHER.

HADDONFIELD, N.J.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for your fine, brave statements on South Vietnam. It takes great courage to speak out against the foreign policy as you and others have done. I wish that the American newspapers would publish your statements found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for surely the American public is just uninformed about the true conditions in southeast Asia.

I consider you one of the finest patriots, because you are not afraid to speak out when you see we are not living up to our democratic ideals (and the freedom to voice opinions is a hallmark of our democracy but which should not be censored by the press).

We must try to educate the public to see that the proper place to solve international crises is in the United Nations.

Wish you would run for President.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SALLY PRYOR.

NEWBURGH, N.Y.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your forthright remarks heard a few days ago on the NBC "Today" show certainly pointed up the issues—and dangers—in the Vietnam situation.

As you so rightly said, the appointment of General Taylor to the vacated Lodge post does not augur well for a peaceful settlement of the situation. The deep involvement of this country in the south Asia area and the "policing" action we have undertaken seems very paradoxical in view of our own inability to control our citizens in Mississippi and Florida.

It would seem sort of like people in glass houses throwing stones—or don't do as I do, do as I say.

Please Senator, keep speaking out against further action that commits thousands of American youth to lose their lives to support regimes that are wholly unpopular with the citizens of the country.

Cordially yours,

EDWARD B. SALINGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your courageous and intelligent position and stand against the present reckless U.S. involvement in Vietnam and Laos which, if allowed to pursue its present course, will surely lead to full-scale war and hatred of the whole world against us.

I have just written to President Johnson to tell him that I fully concur with your position in regard to our foreign policy in Vietnam and Laos.

It's pathetic that Congress has so few men of your caliber and stature. You will be remembered in history by your compassion and unusual degree of intelligence.

Wishing you continued success in your efforts to achieve peace for mankind.

Sincerely yours,

JACK KRIEGER.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your ready suggestions for the Vietnam situation show, as always, the long, deep thought that has gone before. Your interview on the program "Today," this morning, brought me the only comfort I have had on that situation.

I, like you, am voting and working for President Johnson this fall. I admire him very much. I feel that now at this very moment is the time that he could well adopt your plan and map out a program for our beloved country which would save the United Nations and finally solve our problem in Asia. That might take years, but we would be on the right track.

For years I have been your respectful admirer.

G. V. RAFF.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 24, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to let you know of my wholehearted support for your critical stand on the situation in Vietnam. Several weeks ago I heard you speak about this on the radio and was impressed by your ideas. Up until this time, I had no notion that anyone in Congress was at all opposed to our provocative and shortsighted policy in the Far East.

It is my understanding that the general goal of American foreign policy should be that of insuring the world peace and at the same time striving for the collapse of world communism. At times our efforts toward both these goals go hand in hand, but sometimes they do not. Since the advent of the nuclear age, the possibility of a military solution is considered out of the question by any thinking person. If so, then it seems the most promising opportunity for victory would consist of swinging the uncommitted peoples of the world over to our side. If we could do this, then we would have innumerable advantages over the Communists, e.g., economically, tradewise, and not the least, the sheer number of people who would be aligned with us.

These uncommitted multitudes in Asia and Africa are just beginning to throw off the shackles of colonialism, ignorance, and the effects of racial and economic exploitation. Communism, as taught in Moscow and Peking, lures them economically from one side. Democracy, and all of the advantages which go with personal freedom, should have at least equal appeal. But does it really? To use the Madison Avenue phrase, just what is our "image" in the eyes of the world. I wonder what sort of glowing impression our Government makes by support of a military

15164

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

dictatorship which is primarily engaged in the business of killing peasants. Does this really add to the stature of the world's number one power? I fear that to the many little people of the world this must take on the features of a David and Goliath struggle. This feeds beautifully into the Communist propaganda line that we are aggressive warmongers. By point of fact, in Vietnam we are doing just that.

History teaches, and teaches bitterly, that revolutionary activity cannot be effectively put down unless the Government's effort has the strong support of the people behind it. Military rulers and petty dictators of all sorts lack this popular support since by definition their rule is self-imposed and maintained by repression of the opposition. Often this is bulwarked by American dollars.

Now let us take stock of some of our supposed "allies" and "comrades in arms" in the struggle against world communism. Of what possible benefit is it to the American people to be associated with creatures such as Chiang Kai-Shek, Franco, Madame Nu, or the present military junta in Saigon, to name but a few. In time of peace, we absorb all of the rotten aspects of their reputations by the simple fact that we support and condone them. In time of war, does anyone honestly think that any of these small-time Hitlers will stand gallantly by our side. More likely than not they will flee the country with the gold we have given them as many others have before.

This letter is already much too long. But again I would say that your position in this vital issue is important, even if it is not popular at the moment. Neither are many other positions popular where real courage is required. Too often, basic political and philosophical change must be made by individuals like yourself who stand for a time alone in opposition to the compact majority.

Very truly yours,

SIDNEY L. COPEL, Ed. D.,
Clinical Pathologist.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, OF OREGON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We see you on TV. You are right about going to war with Red China.

It should be taken to the United Nations. We don't want war; it should be solved in some peaceful way. We don't want our sons to die for such a fool cause. If they go to war with Red China it will make us weak and then Russia will step in. I think we should keep our nose out of foreign affairs. Let the United Nations do the job.

A FRIEND FROM OHIO
(With Three Sons,
not willing to see them die).

JUNE 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know how we admired you for your outspoken comments on the "Today" program this morning.

You have given us a small feeling of security, but what has us baffled is that more men, supposed to be the leaders of our country, just follow along.

Frankly we are very concerned about our Nation and its future—the TV and magazines and press distort the facts of what is really happening and the average person in our country today will not dig in and try to find the truth. They would prefer to watch a murder mystery or hillbilly program on TV.

As an individual there seems to be so little we can do—so many of our young people have been completely brainwashed.

Our America is not what it once was, or what it should be. Everyone is out for his own gain and what he can get for himself with the least amount of effort.

One of the main troubles in our world today stems from greed.

We both had the feeling that the program panel was somewhat awestruck by your comments, and we seriously doubt that had they known, you perhaps would never have been asked to appear. These are the things they are trying to hide from the people.

Please keep the courage of your convictions as we need more men in Washington, like yourself, to fight these battles.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARVIN S. COCHRANE.

TORRANCE, CALIF.

June 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the position you have taken against the continued and increasing undeclared war in Indochina. It is a small comfort that we have at least one Senator with some decency left.

I suppose the theory is that village-burning and the rest of it was legalized long ago by the British and such modern improvements as we may add are only natural, the people being "natives" who put no value on human life. Besides, they haven't any aircraft and we have a deal with the Russians.

Admiral Felt announced this weekend that we are going to risk war with China, but that China would be afraid to risk war with us, since they know we are too strong. This sounds like the thinking of Douglas MacArthur, who ended up wanting to use cobalt bombs.

Presumably Felt's statement is policy, since he is commander in chief. And presumably this is the policy of the President, the State Department, and the Government.

All I know is, we never voted for it. What seems to be the case is that the war-happy generals and the CIA invasionmakers are running the show and this business of democracy and an election is nonsense and just for the papers.

It seems hopeless to try to do something about it since it is not subject to vote or to control by elected representatives. The whole thing proceeds as though GOLDWATER had won—and he's not even nominated yet.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. MANNING.

(Copy to President Lyndon B. Johnson.)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Not being a constituent of yours I write as an American citizen to say that I fully agree with your position stated on the TV "Today" program this date that our President does not have the constitutional right to prosecute war in South Vietnam.

However, you also said that you were going to the Democratic convention and support the President and do all you could to insure his reelection.

This is the second time recently that I have heard a U.S. Senator seriously disagree with and oppose the President on an issue of tremendous importance—this time you say real war could result—and then heard the Senator announce that he will help elect the erring one. The logic of such a course escapes the ordinary person, and I should like to ask how we in a democracy can hope to secure the good government and peace we so earnestly desire if we continue to vote for, support, and elect those whom we say oppose such? I hope the answer is not the old worn out one that all the other prospec-

tive candidates, both Democratic and Republicans, would do worse things.

With assurance of my esteem, I am,
Very respectfully,

N. W. BOWDEN.

P.S.—The above inquiry from one born and reared a Democrat will probably seem to ignore party loyalty when the issue transcends it in importance. It is a sincere inquiry.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to let you know that we agree with your views on Vietnam, and we admire you for your courageous and forceful expression of them. We hope you will continue to find it possible to talk sense even when this touches on the sensitivities of people in high places. We are confident that good sense will prevail, and that in the long run the course of world events will be determined by those who are prepared to face issues realistically and with human understanding.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET FINN.

ROBERT FINN.

(Copies President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary Robert S. McNamara.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I agree with you every time you open your mouth. On the situation in Vietnam you make sense.

The ominous appointment of General Taylor to ambassadorship is extremely alarming. I have written the President, also.

You are, I know, a man of stature among men of a ludicrous political specie.

We cannot afford the luxury of playing this war game, lest the world be launched in a third world war, directed (I might add) at the North American Continent, as well as engulfing the entire world.

Please, take continued courage to speak out in the Halls of Government for what is politically and morally right. My husband also agrees with you.

I know you have had many well-wishers.

Sincerely,

PAT R. STACKOVICH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please let me congratulate you on your outspoken and courageous stand with regard to Vietnam. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with you, and I am sure that many, many, who, like you, are in possession of the facts, know that you speak the truth but lack your courage, and would endanger America and the future of the world rather than risk political careers.

I should think that even those who do not agree with you would have great admiration for your integrity. The tragic truth is that history, I am sure, will prove you were right, but, I am afraid, too late to save us.

My profoundest respects to a true American.

Sincerely,

MILDRED ROGERS.

(Copy to President L. B. Johnson.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your talk on TV about the U.S. policy I'm sure is shared by many—why don't they stand up and be counted.

This policy will continue only as long as the mass of the people are ignorant, or for one reason or other afraid to speak up.

Your referral to the 30 Austrians doubling to 60 was an eye opener, although we should know by now how such things work.

Please, Senator MORSE, try to get on TV and radio oftener—make the people realize it's their lives and the lives of their loved ones that are at stake.

I wish there was some organization I could join to help others to wake up and be counted, as it really is later than they think—much later—maybe even too late.

Sincerely,

PEGGY KLEMPNER.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just heard you on the "Today" program, and you are the first one I have listened to that has made any sense. I have always thought that the Congress made the decision if we were to have war, but President Johnson seems to be the one to decide. Like you I don't think Red China can be bluffed with our threats, and just might fool us, if we think they will back down.

They have 700 million people as you say they don't care about human life and they could send waves and waves of men against us. Khrushchev would love us to have war with them that would save their men and fighting with them, and in the meantime when we were fighting China they would start something in Berlin, and also in Cuba. You're right we are the only ones in South Vietnam where are our Allies?

They are smart they are staying out. Will you please go on Meet the Press and tell the people about this mess we got ourselves in. Fighting thousands of miles away, and forgetting all about Cuba right at our doorstep.

Mr. MORSE I have always voted Democratic but at this time I feel like thousands more people not to vote for anyone. If you were running for President I would vote for you as you are the only one I ever heard that thought the same as I do.

We are at war in Vietnam, as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, and sending an Army man to take Lodge's place does not look good to me. What good does it do to have a United Nations if the problems can't be brought to them to settle, I have also wondered what they are doing all along about this crisis in South Vietnam? Can one man, the President, make this decision to have our boys killed as they are every day over there (he has two girls) and talk so brave we will fight to the finish.

As you said we cannot police Asia, maybe Russia (Khrushchev) is pretending to be angry at China and provoke a war with us then go in with China. Its easy to start a war, but to stop it and get out of it is another thing. Our Allies as you say are sitting on the sidelines, and saying what fools.

De Gaulle sees the folly of us doing what we are doing, and he is not going along with us in our decisions to make a fool of ourselves. That "Washington Pipeline" column the other day said Russians are installing a new missile in Cuba that doesn't need a launching pad. Capable of being launched from a tank-type vehicle, the missile's range from 600 to 1,100 miles.

Mr. MORSE, please shout from the hilltops we are doing wrong to stay in Vietnam, also where are the Nationalist Chinese (I spelt that wrong) but will you ask will Chinese fight Chinese? Years ago when I was a kid I read a book called "Carpenter's Asia" about the yellow peril to come some day.

When Japan started the war I then figured maybe the yellow races would get together then. You never hear anything any more about Red China and Russia being at odds since we took over and are fighting Khrushchev's batties. Boy, is he jumping with glee? Just what he wanted, things couldn't

be better for him. Playing right into his hands.

Please, Senator MORSE, you are the most intelligent man yet to go on TV and tell the people "wake up, America" before its too late, and gets out of hand, and brings us to war.

ALONE

Our allies are not with us in spirit. Sometimes I feel like a voice in the wilderness; there are so many things I seem to feel that are not right, but what can I do?

China? There lies a sleeping giant. Let him sleep. For when he wakes, he will move the world.

Napoleon said that years ago. Will close this letter, and don't remain quiet; Mr. MORSE, you have the right answers.

Mrs. A. ENSKO.

St. Louis, Mo.

P.S.—Please excuse this typewriting; its this crazy machine.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,

June 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are grateful to you for what you are doing in the Senate and on television to change U.S. southeast Asia policy. The enclosed copy of my letter to the Secretary of State expresses my views. Very respectfully yours,

W. F. UNRUH.

P.S.—You need not take the trouble to answer this letter. I am writing to let you know how glad we are for men like you in our Senate.

The editor of the Correspondent quotes a Japanese Intellectual of Tokyo who has been in touch with some Chinese intellectuals as follows:

"My friend, there is one thing I fear more than anything else. It is that the United States may carry the Vietnam war into the North. There is absolutely no question but that the Chinese would then enter the war against the Americans. They are desperately afraid of America. Chinese on all levels see it as the aggressive and expansionist center of world imperialist reaction. They would enter the Vietnamese war as a matter of national survival. This is as certain as that we sit here."

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,

June 24, 1964.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: The news release that our President has appointed Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to replace Henry Cabot Lodge in South Vietnam, and that our Government is considering going into war with China by military action against North Vietnam is frightening to us. To go to war with China I feel would be a tragic blunder because it would cost millions of lives and would turn the world against us. A professed Christian nation surely should not do what many believe will lead to a world war.

Why does not our Government allow the United Nations to seek a solution to the southeast Asia problem? Through the United Nations world opinion would discipline China and help bring about a solution. The solution might not suit us in every respect, but it would likely be the best solution possible at this time. I feel strongly that U.S. unilateral military action is inexcusable when we have the United Nations organization to help keep the peace.

Therefore, I wish to make another plea that our Government bring the South Vietnam problem to the United Nations Assembly or to the Geneva Conference for solution.

Our Government has not lived up to the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and the world knows this. We will need to bring U.S. policy into line with the peaceful purposes of the United Nations, and respect the longing of mankind for peace. I, for one, feel that China would respect world opinion as expressed through the United Nations.

Very respectfully yours,

W. F. UNRUH.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to take just a moment to tell you how much I have admired, over the years, your courageous and often single-handed fight for principle, truth and right.

Specifically I want to encourage you to continue in your opposition to our unconscionable involvement in Vietnam. This, and the Cuba business, have made me ashamed of my country, ashamed in a fundamental and permanent manner. These issues are crucial to what we as a nation believe and stand for, and if they represent the real answer, then—well, then I shall remain ashamed.

I would like to describe myself as a young college graduate—well, 32 years old—a civil servant, father, property owner and generally unexceptional. Sometimes the source of support is as important as the support itself.

Please keep up your efforts. I think you have demonstrated that the voters will support this kind of politics even more than the usual kind.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. HANSTEEN.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I listened to your broadcast this morning on the "Today" TV program, and I am writing as an American citizen in support of your position that war is not the solution to the problems that face our government in southeast Asia.

My wife and I have spent our lives as Baptist educational missionaries in China and of late years in Japan. Our purpose has been to teach the Christian way of life to students and to the people.

We have often found ourselves unable to support our commercial and industrial interests of the United States who have too often looked upon the Chinese labor and resources as an opportunity to make money by use of cheap labor and cheap raw materials. This system also made a small number Chinese of the compradore class rich, while the lot of the farmer, the intellectuals, and the craftsmen became worse and worse. The occupation of China by the U.S. Armed Forces during 1945-48 did nothing to help the common Chinese, indeed their lot became worse.

Since 1948 the great western powers have given up their colonial policy so-called except the United States who are now engaged in a war with Vietnam to prevent the people of Vietnam from having political and economic control of southeast Asia.

Senator CHURCH of Idaho, on the "Today" show stated in his broadcast that large scale armed intervention in southeast Asia by American Armed Forces may result in the union of all the people of Asia into a race war against the white Americans, and at the same time may result in drawing the Chinese and Russians together against the United States.

Today the Asahi paper published in Tokyo stated and I quote, "A war between United

15166

States and China would be of truly great concern to us Japanese who also live in Asia," unquote.

The hour is very late maybe too late to avoid a great war in the Pacific, but I know you will do your best to get the issues before the American people and what they face if they try to use raw military power against the nearly 2 billion people of Asia.

Please do your best Senator in this time of crisis to help us.

Respectfully your,

STERLING BEATH.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday I saw and heard you on the "Today" program of NBC. What you said is important, not only for the United States but for the whole world and I hope you will continue your fight to have this brought to the U.N.

If we fought a war in southeast Asia, the problems there would still be unsolved, just as they are in Korea. These problems are compounded, rather than reduced by war.

Also, I hope you can help to see that the laws of the United States apply also to the State of Mississippi. Our son Douglas is among the young voter registration educators there. The rights of citizenship must be extended to all Americans.

Greetings to TERRY OLSON.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY F. BATZ.

P.S.—Formerly from Montana and still remembering our discussion on the plane going to India (in 1958).

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Although I have written you before, sir, my admiration and gratitude for and to you are of such dimension that I must let you know again.

I'm grateful to providence that we have men of your caliber. You are my favorite Senator and have been for many years; may God bless you, sir.

My view runs parallel with yours, sir, from alpha to omega.

Knowing that God is just, I often tremble over my country's behavior; but I know that you intrepidly endeavor to retard the trigger-happy ones. Again Senator Morse, "It may make a difference to all eternity whether we do right or wrong today."

May I also ask you, sir, to convey my gratitude to your fellow Senators HUMPHREY, CHURCH, and others of good will.

As for the vultures—let them shrill. Thanks again and again, sir.

Respectfully and gratefully yours,
HJALMAR JOHNSON.

ADRIAN, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've just heard you on the "Today" show.

You have given me hope, as you undoubtedly have millions of others who heard you express your views so daringly and so clearly—that someone in Washington is aware of what is going on and even though it is going against the actions of leaders in his own party, has the courage to ask what the majority of your countrymen are asking—Why are we acting alone? Why are we bypassing the United Nations? Why are we sending our soldiers to die in the Far East?

We are rebelling against what those in high office are doing to our country—the Supreme Court making our laws and scrapping the Constitution. Taking away the rights of the majority and catering to a minority resulting in chaos. Getting us into

a war which we cannot win and for which we have no heart.

Those in the highest offices have lied to us until we have no confidence in what we are told—the latest, denial of the resignation of Lodge when we know, now, he had resigned when the denial was made. The replacements weren't decided overnight.

The administration making a fool of itself to its countrymen and the whole world—Johnson expecting plaudits for trying to "settle the crisis in Cyprus" while preparing for a real war in Asia. Stating that Russia "agrees" to stay out of a war with Red China, expecting it to break a pact with Red China, but not to break that agreement.

Why have GOLDWATER and Wallace gone over so dramatically? The people see what is taking place and will vote for anyone who will promise to reverse the present trend.

Sincerely,

SESTA T. MATHEISON.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for explaining on the "Today" show, why our southeast Asian war problem, has not been taken to the United Nations. It is a unique experience today to be told the truth, and I am most grateful to you, as are all of my neighbors, with whom I have spoken this morning.

Yours truly,

LUCY CHURCHILL.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I certainly want to congratulate you on your stand regarding the expansion of our military activities in southeast Asia. I can't see where the administration is trying to save anything but face; and believe me I don't think the administrative face that they will save, is worth the lives of our boys who already have been killed there. Much less the lives of the many thousands more who will be killed with an expanded war.

I further think, that it's too expensive a lesson in lives for our military to obtain practical experience in this manner. I was under the impression that the Congress had the power to declare war. Are you, worthy gentlemen, of these two legislative bodies going to surrender this responsibility to the administration?

It seems to me that too many legislative prerogatives are being surrendered to the administrative branch.

I'm sending a copy of this letter to Senators McNAMARA and HART of Michigan, and Congressman BROOMFIELD from my district.

Yours very respectfully,

J. M. ROBINSON.

(Copies to Senator HART, Senator McNAMARA, and Congressman BROOMFIELD.)

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard Senator MORSE this morning on the "Today Show" and agree with him completely, as far as our foreign policy in the Far East is concerned. I'm sending you a copy of the letter I've written him today. I certainly solicit your activity in support of his attitude.

It seems to me that thinking men, who remember Korea, and the thousands upon thousands of American men and women who lost their lives or were otherwise maimed or severely crippled, do everything possible to avoid another conflict.

Not only did we not win the war in Korea, but we are continuing to lose the peace

there; and we are destined to the same experience in southeast Asia, if we stay there.

You will notice that our European allies, with 100 years experience in Far Eastern matters, are offering little help.

I fully appreciate that the executive department has the responsibility of foreign policy but the legislation department are the ones that vote the money and can control the situation.

Very respectfully yours,

J. M. ROBINSON.

(Copy to Senator MORSE.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We are very proud of you to stand up and speak against the sending of Americans to South Vietnam. I cannot understand how we have a right to risk any kind of a war anywhere. We think you are a very wise man and know it takes rare courage to speak up in the way that you have.

Sincerely yours,

EMILY PARKER.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am the costar of what has become a popular American television series, "McHale's Navy". I tell you this for purposes of identification because I know it matters little to you.

What I did want to say is that there are those of us that sleep better at night knowing you are in the U.S. Senate.

Please keep up the good fight. You represent not only Oregon, but all of us.

My deep regards,

JOE FLYNN.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When I watched you this morning on the "Today" show on NBC, when you voiced your opinion on Vietnam I was glad about the clear way you explained about a sad point in our present-day history.

Sorry that this is but the stand of a minority but we can grow. I say "we," because I fully share your viewpoint on the situation.

Wishing you success.

ILSE RUTH KUTTNER.

FLINT, MICH.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After wondering aloud the last few weeks not knowing where I stood concerning South Vietnam, I now find myself compelled to urge you to continue your lonely battle against the U.S. Senate.

The American public is being pushed into a war which could feasibly ruin the United States, the United Nations, and the world—and they will have no conception of why we will be fighting.

Any assistance I, as a citizen of the United States and of this world, can do to help in your fight, I will gladly do.

Sincerely,

LEROY A. LOTT, JR.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Every effort should be made to fight against the confirmation of Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

The appointment of the military to a diplomatic post in this critical area at this critical time is an exposure of our intention to escalate the war.

This could well lead to a nuclear conflict and should be opposed with every energy at your disposal.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL STONE.

JUNE 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank goodness for the voice of WAYNE MORSE raised against the Vietnamese fiasco. That sorry, sorry war—with all those pitiful people embroiled in all that "modern" savagery.

What can the administration be thinking of—election, I suppose—and God help us if the Republicans get elected though sometimes I can't see much difference between them and us.

Of course the United Nations should be taking care of this matter.

And now—well I can't go into Cuba—this is to say—all of my friends agree with you. Sincerely,

MARY GWEN OWEN.

SOUTH FORT MITCHELL, KY.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would be lax as an interested American and as one of your most ardent admirers and supporters, if I did not express my views on your appearance on "Today" this date.

It is a regrettable fact, but a few of us know that the policy being pursued today, is still Duiles brinkmanship, and only a new administrator, and it is far more regrettable that you, one of the best qualified supporters of a better America and world, has to get on your high horse and take out after the one leader who too stands for in most part the things you stand for, as you and I know this is the very thing the GOP, who cannot think of anything good or constructive to propose, so they spend their time trying to pick up a scrap of any difference within the Democratic ranks and exploit it using the press, and TV which they in 98 percent control.

I want to compliment you and your honest and forthright "Morse Manner" disagreeing, caused by honest differences of opinion, which I feel is too right for comfort, as I clearly understand you and from listening to you back on radio, as Republican, then Independent, and as Democrat, also in our convention, as I work as a representative of the International Association of Machinists AFL-CIO and am away from home trying to assist those who struggle to make ends meet to feed, house, educate, and clothe their families.

You know and I too know that this appearance had great impact on millions who will not write, and so the GOP syndicated columnists who decry everything will use this expression for their own selfish and for most part stupid partisan purposes to try and gain political jobs, for those who would make fast GOP war.

Excuse typing as I am better machinist, rather than typist, using the hunt and peck system.

Your admirer and supporter,

MATTHEW CARR.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Listening in on your television interview yesterday, I am proud to know that we have men of your caliber in Washington.

I am 100 percent behind your suggestion to take our Vietnam problem to the United Nations.

Please continue your efforts for the good of our Nation.

Yours very truly,

MRS. JOHN FELGENHAUER.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH.,

June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: I want to complement you on your views, expressed on the "Today" show concerning our foreign policy in southeast Asia.

I am the average American; voiceless, and concerned about the "American image" throughout the world. We have enough sense to know something is rotten in Denmark, judging by the gaseous bubbles emanating from the cesspool, but confused by the doubletalk. We don't know what it is.

You strengthened out the string for us this morning. Let's call a spade a spade, and proceed to dig with it. America deserves better representation than some of our people are offering.

More power to people who think and speak as you do. I am a working man, 70 years old, have been a Democrat all my life. I don't have to worry about eating any more, but am still a Democrat.

I'd like to shake your hand.

WINFRED KOLLARS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know how grateful I am to you for trying to keep us out of a war. The nuclear weapons today, in case of a war, will destroy our civilization that took centuries to build.

FANNIE LANDER.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the resistance to Johnson's brinkmanship. This alleged war for self-determination once seemed ridiculous and now seems disgusting. Clearly the people of Vietnam, north and south, are quite determined that their future shall not be dictated to them by the United States. I don't know what the Buddhists in Saigon want, or what Ho Chi Minh wants, or what the prisoners in those "free" and fortified hamlets want, nor do I think they are sure of their aims either, but I am pretty damn sure that they do not want more U.S. generals, advisors, planes, guns, murder, and mayhem.

Please push for U.N. guaranteed neutrality, U.N. border patrols and inspectors, etc., for the whole of southeast Asia. A neutral buffer belt around China seems to be our best hope.

Why don't you and Senators GRUENING, MANSFIELD and any other rational or semi-rational Senators put together a policy statement, get signatures from both Houses, publicize it, embarrass people (L.B.J., Taylor, Lodge, et al.) with it.

See if you can't hold up Senate approval of Maxwell's appointment. Will there be hearings first? Then grill him on his "unique" qualifications for the ambassadorial job.

What can be done to curtail L.B.J.'s power in this area? How best to expose the hypocrisy of our southeast Asia policy?

Yours,

CHARLES KEIL.

SARASOTA, FLA.,

June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Until today, when I listened to what you had to say about our policy in Asia, I thought you were a maverick, but now I'm one of the millions who are behind you 100 percent.

When will Congress take inventory, and start taking back many of the powers it has delegated to the White House and put the executive branch of our Government in the right constitutional perspective.

As you so aptly put it, why not use the United Nations. It is our money that runs most of that debating club, and if it no longer serves any worthwhile purpose, let's get out of it.

My hat's off to you sir, for saying what few, if any other Senator, would have the courage to say. There is still hope for us with men like you on the Hill. I was almost ready to fly my flag at half mast come the 4th, for all the freedoms and constitutional rights I have lost.

F. J. JAKES.

P.S.—Written in person, and since I have no sight, I hope you will forgive any misspelling, and/or typographical errors. Thanks.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yeah, man. You said a mouthful. Pour it on.

In the great tradition of Abraham Lincoln, you have dared stand up and say that the Government of the United States is war-mongering and must stop. You perform an inestimable service to the American people. Believe that we people, though confused, disoriented, and scared (not only by fear of war, but by fear of persecution if we voice our fear of war) will stand up and support a man of your stature who will carry a consistent fight to the people on this question.

What can I do to help?

Sincerely,

FREDERIC I. RINALDO.

AFTON, WYO.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If we only had more Senators like you the world would be a better place.

We could expend our energies on China and be a pushover for Russia. We do not want war. We should pull out of Vietnam. God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. ROY GARDNER.

P.S.—Keep speaking up for that which is right.

BENTONVILLE, ARK.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some "unthinkable thoughts" which should be publicized.

We (the United States) refused to sign the 1954 Geneva Conference Agreement on Far Eastern Affairs which stipulated that a plebiscite be held in North and South Vietnam in 1956.

We instead strengthened our ties with Ngo Dinh Diem (later recognized as a fraud and murdered).

We sent a general in civilian clothes to assist the Diem regime "as an adviser."

We sent more than 16,000 armed men without the necessary approval of Congress to carry on a war.

We now call it a war and decorate casualties accordingly.

We now send another general, presumably in civilian clothes, as Ambassador to South Vietnam.

We now threaten to attack North Vietnam from South Vietnam and the South China Sea and Laos from Thailand.

We call the rebels of South Vietnam and Laos Vietcong or Communists, not "Washington rebels."

Congress has not declared war and the mass of people of the United States do not want war.

Who is running this country? Is it McNamara who represents the capitalistic interests?

The voices of Senators MORSE, FULBRIGHT, and GRUENING must be louder and persistently echoed throughout the land. Let no one be so greedy or puerile and fail to be

15168

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

aware that, if the United States attacks North Vietnam and China, Soviet Russia will not remain idle. Our own treatment of the Negroes and Asians will limit aid and friendship from the African and Asian Continents. This is the nuclear age where dollar diplomacy is on the wane because the Baruch plan failed which left the United States without a monopoly of nuclear power.

Just as the industrial-military complex assumes the privilege of issuing almost daily press releases which promote the interests only of the industrial-military complex so should our Foreign Relations Committee, our elected Senators and Representatives, who represent the people and not special interests, issue as many releases which reveal a deep concern for our country as a whole, without ulterior motives limited to a powerful minority.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WM. P. ENGEL.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We were downright relieved to hear the ideas you expressed on the "Today" show this morning. We wish these convictions were more widespread. It seems to us, too, our military activities in Vietnam are just for nothing—for nothing. We have high regard for President Johnson and we can't understand why he and Dean Rusk and MacNamara, etc., are for going on with this futile war. How can we bring about a change in policy? It's so tragic to see what's happening.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIS RICH.

P.S.—South Vietnam should be a United Nations problem.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for a rare and courageous voice speaking out for a sane and sober approach to our South Vietnamese policy.

As you mentioned, the Vietnamese war is McNamara's war—but it also seems true, as a reporter questioner put it to you—whether the forthcoming election was not a reason for the President's warlike activity?

I believe it is true, that with cessation of war, our economy will suffer, unless our economic planners work out a program of reconversion to peacetime industrial production—the future does not look too bright. We all look forward to your good health and clear thinking.

Sincerely,

ROSE KARSHMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have written President Johnson urging him not to extend the war in Vietnam, but we also want to thank you for your tremendous efforts in preserving peace in the world. Your stand moved us to write to the President and I am sure that it will serve as a rallying point—indeed it already seems to be doing so—for those who want to live in peace. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JERRY RICHARD.

OSKALOOSA, KANS.

SENATOR MORSE: I turned on the TV program June 25, "Today" and must say keep up the good work for peace.

I have felt all along it is such a mistake to send our boys to Vietnam to mix in that war. Our poor boys sent all over the world

to fight in other nations, it's time someone tells the folks who are responsible for it. What is wrong with our U.N. representatives? I sent a son to the Second World War and I know what it means for a mother to send her dear sons to fight on foreign soil. He started in North Africa and got clear around to France. Was gone 3 years. I think we mothers might put a stop to it if we would fight a little too. I've been a Republican but when I see a Democrat who gets things done I'm for him. I don't want to see my grandsons have to go and fight in other nation's wars. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RAY ENGLE.

PROVIDENCE, KY.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with a great deal of pleasure that I listened to your interview yesterday.

Please talk this over with other Senators, the U.N., and President Johnson.

Thanking you.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. ORVILLE G. WITHERS.

INK, ARK., June 26, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: These few words to compliment you on your stand in South Vietnam. The whole blame country and all the American capital invested there isn't worth the life of one American soldier. Sooner or later we are going to have to get out and the sooner the better.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. GILBERT.

NEWTONVILLE, MASS.,
June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE OF OREGON,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Government.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for speaking the truth so openly about the mistaken policy of the United States of America in South Vietnam.

The International League for Peace and Freedom founded by Jane Addams and Emily Balch is working as hard as we know how for the change in policy that you advocate.

All the forces there should be under the U.N. as you suggest. Ho Chi Minh tries to run a socialistic government in North Vietnam. He does not want to be ruled by the Chinese Communists.

Mr. Chakravarty, an Indian intellectual, who teaches at Boston University, recently spent 3 weeks in and about Saigon. He says that it is a reign of terror there, that these gentle people had a good agriculture on their fertile soil, but you said, I think that U.S. Army troops occupy the peninsula, which contained the best ricefields.

Yes, we are letting the Pentagon and the arms manufacturers run our foreign relations. When Japan's military clique got power, they brought Japan into the war on the side of Hitler.

The "Today" show is watched by millions all across the country. I am writing to congratulate them on having such an able, forthright speaker on their program as Senator Morse, from Oregon.

I have cousins living in the beautiful city of Portland, Brener, and Snowhill, and Dee.

Gratefully yours,

ALICE L. MURDOCH.

GLEN ELLYN, ILL.,
June 27, 1964.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE,
Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Ill.:

Senator MORSE's suggestion that the Vietnam problem be placed before the United Nations is an excellent one.

I hope this can be done, and quickly, too.
KATHARINE K. MOORE.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You can always be depended upon for sensible suggestions with regard to our ever-increasing problems. I hope you will continue to grace the Senate for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,

KATHARINE K. MOORE.

FOXBORO, MASS.,

June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your efforts to bring the Senate to a meaningful consideration of the space authorization bill.

In the past—Telstar, Vietnam—in your role as devil's advocate you have indeed proven yourself a statesman.

I do wish I were a constituent of yours that this letter and my feelings on your performance would be of tangible value.

Best wishes for your future efforts.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. AYLWARD.

SCHWEIZ, SWITZERLAND.

To Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senator Morse, Senator Fulbright, Kiplinger Washington Letter, Stone's Weekly Letter:

One of the best European newsletters, Zuercher Wirtenchaftsbrieft, who has excellent sources of information, reported from Paris that De Gaulle fears President Johnson might be forced, still before elections, into a "strike of violence" against China (perhaps to prove that he is as "hard" as GOLDWATER).

One of the two leading Swiss weeklies, Zuercher Woche of Zuerich, published on June 26, 1964, an editorial with the title "America's Janus Head," comparing America's policy in Cyprus and in southeast Asia.

After a positive comment on America's policy in Cyprus, it comments on America's policy in southeast Asia with the following sentences which are doubly remarkable because Switzerland is the most anti-Communist country in West Europe:

"In the last 14 days the American warnings, or rather threats, against North Vietnam and China have been so frequent that it is not too early to speak of a dangerous situation. The former commander in Saigon, General Harkins, could publicly declare, without being reprimanded, that it would be very advantageous to risk war with China, in order to protect South Vietnam against a Communist takeover. Between May 17 and June 21, American planes, in undisputed violation of the Laos agreements, made more than 200 reconnaissance and bombing flights over the Pathet Lao territory.

"The appointment of the Chief of the General Staff, Maxwell Taylor, as Ambassador of the United States of America in Saigon shows who commands in South Vietnam and what is planned. What would the Americans say if Marshal Malinowski would be appointed as Ambassador in the German Democratic Republic (East Germany)?

"Obviously, the American circles who decide policies, concluded the rift between Moscow and Peiping became so deep and irreparable that China can be treated the hard way without Moscow considering this as need to assist its ally. Perhaps these people assume even a silent Russian consent. One must warn against this. Similarly, as the Soviet Union went into a trap in Cuba, so Washington can get into a trap in southeast Asia. Such action could end very badly."

In 1939, the German Government risked war with Poland, assuming that England would stay out. This error has cost the lives of 30 million men, women, and children. A similar error about China might

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15169

cost the lives of 300 million people in America, Asia, and Europe.

K. KAUFFMANN,
Citizen of the United States of America,
Democratic Voter, Never a Communist
or Member of Any Communist-Front
Organization.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have tried to the best of our abilities to follow the developments in South Vietnam and find ourselves constantly at odds with the concept of a military solution.

It is therefore with particular pleasure that we have followed your repeated requests that the problems of southeast Asia be put before the United Nations.

We sincerely hope that you will continue to pursue this course.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. M. A. ZUCK.
(Copies to the President of the United States and the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH.)

ROGERS PARK COMMITTEE FOR A
SANE NUCLEAR POLICY,
Chicago, Ill., June 10, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Rogers Park Chapter, National Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy wishes to praise the courageous and enlightened stand you have taken on Vietnam.

In the struggle of rival ideologies it is often difficult to think in terms of what is best for humanity as a whole. We would like to encourage your work in hopes of changing the devastating course which our administration has embarked upon in Vietnam.

Please continue your efforts in this field.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN KATZ,
Chairman.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written the President opposing the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam and opposing our dangerous role in that area. I urged him to support your position placing the entire matter before the United Nations and letting that body solve this problem.

I want to express my wholehearted support to you and to your colleagues in the Senate for speaking out and alarming the American people to this grave threat to the peace of the world and to the United Nations. I congratulate you and wish you good health and the strength to carry on.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ANNETTE CIMRING.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With reference to the press interview on the TV "Today" show that was broadcast at 7:30 a.m., p.s.t. on June 25, 1964.

We most heartily agree with you on all points. The Vietnam situation should be the function of the United Nations to resolve. We as a nation have no business whatsoever to send our boys to be killed in what is really a domestic affair of another nation. That wornout slogan, "To Fight

Communism" was used by Hitler as the excuse for the Germans to conquer the entire world.

No nation need have any fear of communism, unless, the people of a nation are suffering injustices, such as: unemployment, racial discrimination, military dictatorship, or the tendency thereto, economic inequalities where a portion of the nation live in luxury and a portion live in dire poverty.

Our country is fortunate indeed to have a Senator with your courage and rationalism, and to fearlessly state the facts as you have. We are proud of your, Sir. We regret that we do not have a greater number of Senators with the same attributes.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. and NEVA BOURNIER.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wholeheartedly support your position that we should not get involved in a war on the mainland of southeast Asia, and should withdraw our military forces from South Vietnam.

Keep up the good work, I have just finished writing to President Johnson supporting your position, and am going to write my Congressmen and Senators.

Sincerely,

BEN W. ANDERSON, JR.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm sure that a great number of concerned people were relieved and given fresh hope by your views on yesterday's "Today" show of NBC.

More strength and courage to you and others who have now for months given us subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD hope that the U.N. may be brought into a peace settlement in Asia. It seems as if the press and news media of all kinds have guessed wrongly that your views and points in favor of legal action through U.N. should be suppressed. May the new awareness be heightened also by a more tolerant view of U.N. by Senator CHURCH's remarks on "Today" this morning.

Thank you and blessings on your vigorous stand for some way to have world authority replace U.S. military domination in a new world which will not accept the latter.

Sincerely,

MERWIN HUMPHREY.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just to let you know we are behind you in your effort to open the eyes of the American people on what is happening in southeast Asia.

We will do our part to bring your message to the people of California.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CARLTON MOSS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Listening to you on the "Today" program.

Am only an old woman, but I do now and have always admired you. You talk like I feel. But what can we little people do. I do not like McNamara and never have, he even looks too stern. Our Senator Young is also a good man and does not like this business in Asia. It bothers me because of our boys getting killed out there. Does our country want to rule the world. Thought we were for peace. Also, I know plenty of people who do not like to have our country and our boys over in Asia. But we are nothing. It does not matter how we feel or talk, in Washington, they will go ahead and do just whatever they like. I wish they in

Washington would get rid of the war mongers. This is not a fine letter, but this Asian thing bothers me a lot.

And please do all you can to help our boys. And we talk about Russia. Who are we to say anything.

Respectfully,

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Mrs. J. DUARANT.

JUNE 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a carbon of a letter I sent to President Johnson today with regard to the dangerous situation in southeast Asia. I want you to know that I will do what little I can to see that the U.S. military presence is removed from that part of the world and that I am grateful for the stands that both you and Senator GRUENING have taken on that U.S. presence.

Sincerely,

WANAQUE, N.J.

HENRY KLEIN.

JUNE 27, 1964.

President JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The increasing involvement of U.S. money, equipment, and troops in southeast Asia is for me a source of rising apprehension. It troubles me that when the Attorney General of this country can say, with regard to three civil rights workers in Mississippi, that there is little he can do under existing laws, that this same country, in southeast Asia, can pursue a policy in blatant disregard of the law, the Geneva Accord, as well as the sentiments of the peoples of both South Vietnam and Laos.

What can the justification be when the Vietcong are fighting a legitimate civil war with popular support in South Vietnam, and the situation in Laos arises out of the right-wing coup d'etat earlier this year rather than the withdrawal of the Pathet Lao from the coalition government which the coup made inevitable. There can be no justification for a policy that risks total war in an area in which we have no rights save that in withdrawing we might lose face. Do we not have a greater obligation to all mankind to preserve peace?

If I am called up to fight in southeast Asia, I cannot with conscience do anything else but refuse. I will not help to bolster a regime so terribly repressive as that of South Vietnam, and though I would not hesitate to fight for the legitimate defense of our own country, I will not fight in Southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

WANAQUE, N.J.

HENRY KLEIN.

OLNEY, TEX.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday I saw you on the "Today" program and I believe you are right in your thinking on the southeast Asia question. I hope you can put your program over and if there is anything that we Americans can help, let us know.

Yours Truly,

R. N. LUNN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse and applaud your valiant efforts to extricate this country from the war in South Vietnam. I am appalled that this administration publicly admits plans for extending the conflict into another sovereign state, and am even more appalled by the degree of apathy and resignation in this country, that approves

15170

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 1

by its silence all the monstrous machinations of genocidal war.
God bless you.

STEPHEN LEIPER

LANSING, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

Senators GEORGE D. AIKEN and WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Please accept our support for your courageous position on American policy in the Far East as expressed in your recent TV news statements. We hope other Senators, including our own, will have the courage to join you.

Unless our completely bankrupt brute force approach to Far East problems is reversed we may find that our country will have to pay dearly for the widespread tendency to put political considerations above all else. We can see no other honest explanation for our so obviously ineffective (not to mention immoral) Far East policy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT WASSERMAN.

MARGARET L. WASSERMAN.

(Copies to Senators HART and McNAMARA.)

Mr. MORSE. I shall speak at greater length on the subject today outside the morning hour, but I wish to say that the war should not be made our war in Asia. We have no right to make it our war in Asia. We have no right to kill American boys in Asia. There is no basis for the United States not to have taken it to the United Nations long ago. That is our treaty obligation. There is no basis for our allies not having taken it to the United Nations. I am sad to see my country putting itself in the image and the posture before the world that we are going to exercise our military might first, and then after everyone has surrendered, to us, we shall be willing to negotiate.

Mr. President, we could not make a greater historic mistake than that. One of the great mistakes being made is that we have leaders in this country talking about this as our war in Asia. Who made it our war in Asia? How did it become our war in Asia? It happens to be a threat to the peace of the world, and it ought to be a subject of concern to all peace-loving nations in the world. We ought to be trying to keep the peace in Asia and not make war.

I disassociate myself from all the talk about the war being our war, because we have no right to be making war in Asia.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill (S. 6) authorizing the subsidy of mass transportation systems throughout the United States. Other Senators as well as I voted against the measure primarily, I believe, in the fear that the program would grow interminably and involve a cost far in excess of what anyone could now imagine.

Some discussion took place about the construction of the Interstate Highway System in connection with the bill. We know that the Interstate Highway System has been financed through a trust fund into which moneys have flowed. Those moneys coming from excise taxes imposed specifically for the purpose of financing the program. Yesterday I

stated that in 1962 the Congress directed that a study be made as to ways and means of solving the mass transportation problems of our metropolitan communities. The report on that study is to be made on January 1, 1965. Whether or not in the study the establishment of a mass transportation system trust fund will be contemplated, I do not know.

I am having prepared a resolution which will direct the Secretary of Commerce to make a study of the feasibility of establishing a trust fund to finance the mass transportation system. My resolution will specifically request that a study be made to ascertain whether, out of the fares of each community that is being helped, there may be taken a one-cent or a two-cent charge, to be paid into the trust fund, so as, at least in part, to finance the subsidy. I shall have that resolution ready for introduction sometime within the next week.

I make this statement to call the attention of my colleagues to the advisability of studying whether or not we can, in part, make self-sustaining this huge new subsidy.

I yield the floor.

CHEROKEE TRIBE PRAISED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Cherokee Indians over many years have made a vital contribution to the development and culture of Oklahoma. Recently the Kansas City Star, of June 7, 1964, published a full-page story on William W. Keeler, principal chief of the Cherokee Tribe and a top official of the Phillips Petroleum Co. As an accompaniment to the biography of Keeler as "a big chief, both of oil and Indians," the Star devoted an article to the traditions and culture of the Cherokee's. The tribe's religion, laws, education, and customs are described with such interest that I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author says that the Cherokee culture is revered by Cherokee descendants. I also admire it, as do most other Oklahomans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS OF FAMED INDIAN TRIBE A SOURCE OF PRIDE IN OKLAHOMA

The traditions and culture of the Cherokee Indians are revered by their thousands of descendants, but by none more than their present principal chief, William W. Keeler, Phillips Petroleum executive who is the eubject of the accompanying article.

Keeler's ancestors were among the more than 13,000 Cherokees who were forced to leave their homes in Georgia in the 1830's by a white man's government that, in retrospect, appears to have been singularly unenlightened. More than 4,000 of the Indians, men, women, and children, died on the tortuous 1,000-mile march on the "Trail of Tears" to Oklahoma Territory.

Signifying changes wrought by the passing years, it was 2 years ago that the eastern capital of the Cherokees at New Echota, Ga., restored at a cost of \$95,000, was dedicated at a special homecoming program attended by Keeler and other distinguished members of the ancient tribe.

Although Keeler does not worship in the Seven Clan religion of his ancestors, he believes it is a source of inspiration for the full-

blood Cherokees who do. In the ritual of the Seven Clan, the members stand at seven points around an eternal fire (the supreme great spirit).

Young members of the clan respect and treat one another as brothers and sisters and consider all of the older members as their mothers and fathers and pledge to protect and care for them.

The "eternal flame," fed by fuel of wood, is brought forth from a hiding place for regular worship ceremonies. Believers say it was lighted back in antiquity, when lighting probably was the only source of fire, and has been kept alive by the tribe ever since.

The flame was borne along the Trail of Tears in a brazier or earthen vessel from a hiding place in the fastness of Georgia hills. It has a tribal significance the Cherokees do not divulge. Only faithful keepers know its hiding place.

In the Civil War, the Cherokee Nation fought on the side of the Confederacy. Members of the tribe owned slaves, but emancipated them February 18, 1863.

Long before Columbus discovered America, the Cherokees, one of the five civilized tribes, possessed tribal customs preserving the rights of property ownership and providing punishment for crimes. Tribal customs served with the force of law until 1808, when the written statutes first came into existence.

The tribe's first organic law, patterned somewhat on the U.S. Constitution, was adopted in 1817. Ten years later it was broadened to set up legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the government. As far back as the 1820's the tribe members were building roads and schools.

From the beginnings, Cherokee laws characteristically encouraged education. Compulsory attendance of schoolchildren was pioneered by the Cherokees. They elected their chieftains by popular vote.

Intermarriage of relatives, extending to cousins, was prohibited. A complete system of courts, corresponding to our courts today, included a supreme court and an attorney general. Until 1875, most crimes were punishable by whipping. Hanging was the penalty for murder and rape. Larceny of stock was a serious offense, the punishment being 50 lashes upon the bare back for the first offense and 100 for the second. On their third conviction, the culprits were hanged.

The Cherokees held truth in high regard, and perjury was one of the most serious offenses under their laws.

The Cherokee Advocate, the first newspaper in Oklahoma, was established in 1845 and printed in both Cherokee and English. The first long distance telephone west of the Mississippi River was between Tahlequah and Fort Gibson. Greek and astronomy were in the curriculum of tribal seminaries operating in 1851.

When statehood was granted to Oklahoma in 1907, the Cherokees and the other four civilized tribes—Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole—ceased to exist as political entities because their property passed into the domain of the 46th State.

ALLEGHENY AIRLINES, A CARRIER SERVING WEST VIRGINIA, STUDIES ACQUISITION OF JET-PROP AIRCRAFT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Allegheny Airlines is one of three local service air carriers which bring benefit to the citizens of West Virginia. Serving three major cities and areas of the Mountain State—Huntington, Parkersburg, and Wheeling—this progressive company provides vital airfreight, airmail, and passenger transportation capability on a daily scheduled basis. As a partner in